

16  
Duplicate in 205 R 256  
Published by the Alumni Association of Marshall College.

THE  
MERCERSBURG REVIEW:

DEVOTED TO  
THEOLOGY, LITERATURE AND SCIENCE.

NEQUE ENIM QUÆRO INTELLIGERE UT CREDAM, SED CREDO UT INTELLIGAM:—  
Anselm.

VOLUME II.—NUMBER IV.

JULY, 1850.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Malancthon and the Present. By T. A.	325
Ecclesiastical Tendencies. By W. J. M.	337
Modern English and Scottish Ballads. By W. M. N.	345
Bible Christianity. By J. W. N.	353
The Birth Day of the Church.	368
Public Worship. By B. C. W.	383
The Human Trinity. By A. J. M. H.	393

MERCERSBURG, PA.:

P. A. RICE, "JOURNAL OFFICE."

1850.

All business letters to be addressed *post-paid* to the "Mercersburg Review."

# MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

## PROSPECTUS FOR 1850.

THE encouragement given to this publication, we are happy to say, has been such as amply to justify its continuance. It will enter, accordingly, upon a new volume, with the opening of the year 1850.

It is published in bi-monthly numbers, under the superintendence of a committee of the Alumni Association of Marshall College, at the price of *Three Dollars* the single copy, per annum, *in advance*.

It is devoted to literature, moral science, and religion. On this general field, it refuses to be bound rigidly by any merely denominational or traditional system, and offers room even for the representation of conflicting views. Its liberality in this respect, however, is not indifferentism, but is conditioned throughout by an earnest interest in the truth. The Review, accordingly, with all its freedom, has been found thus far to carry with it more unity of character than is commonly exhibited by such publications. It has its governing idea, its animating spirit, its distinctive object and method, as something which all may feel and understand. The line in which it seeks to move, is that of a scientific and truly historical faith, in distinction from the two extremes that threaten its overthrow, the one on the right hand and the other on the left. These are, blind outward authority on the one side, which completes itself in the form of Romanism, and no less blind individual freedom on the other side, whose last sense is reached in Rationalism. Both are *extremes*, in which truth under one aspect is converted into falsehood, by being violently sundered from itself under another. The great problem for the present time is believed to be the reconciliation, practically as well as theoretically, of the two tendencies, which lie at the foundation of this wide-spread abuse. On its successful solution would seem to hang the most precious and solemn interests of the age. The whole cause of Protestantism, in particular, will be found at last to stand or fall with the possibility of shunning its own Scylla here, as well as the Charybdis that roars for its destruction on the opposite side. To the service of this high object, the Mercersburg Review offers itself as an earnest though humble auxiliary. Its motto is: Faith before understanding; but still always, also, *in order to* understanding. It accepts Christianity as a fact in the life of the world since Christ, as well as in the Bible; makes common cause with the consciousness of this new life, as it starts in the Apostles' Creed; acknowledges God in history as well as in nature; and seeks both light and freedom, where alone they are to be found, in the bosom of that living order which Christ perpetually upholds by the Church. It will always be *Protestant*, of course, in opposition to the corruptions of Rome; but *Catholic* at the same time, in striving to honor and save the glorious and sublime truths, out of which these corruptions, for the most part, spring. In its controversy with Rome, it will allow no companionship, still, with the radical and rationalistic spirit of the age, engaged ostensibly in the same cause.

**To Booksellers and Publishers.**—THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW, having attained a respectable circulation among theologians and literary men it may be used to advantage by Booksellers and Publishers as an advertising medium. Advertisements will be published on the cover, or on extra leaves when necessary, at the following rates:

Full page, one insertion, \$5.	Three insertions, \$12.	Six insertions, \$20.
Half page, " 3.	" " 7.	" " 12.
Quarter page " 2.	" " 4.	" " 8.

THE  
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

---

JULY, 1850.

---

VOL. II.—NO. IV.

---

MELANCTHON AND THE PRESENT.

*Versuch einer Charakteristik Melancthons als Theologen, und einer Entwickelung seines Lehrbegriffs von Friedrich Gale. Halle, 1840.*

It is the professed object of the book referred to at the head of this article, to give a fair representation of Melancthon, as a theologian in the general acceptation of the term, and more particularly to point out his variations on the two most important subjects in Theology, the Lord's Supper, and the Freedom of the Will. The book indeed, as the author says, sprung originally from a previous article on his variations in doctrine, but as these constitute but a part of his mental history, it was a happy idea in the author, that led him to seek for those portions that remained, and to clothe them with life and beauty. In this he has happily succeeded, and we consequently have an internal history of Melancthon in all its parts, the only true history, which can be given of a scholar, who has spent his time in reflection, rather than in practical life. The book is thorough, that is, it quotes original authority for proof, and it may be regarded, we presume, as standard authority on all subjects connected with the life of the Reformer. In Germany it has taken its place in the theological literature of the day, as a "monograph," a

VOL. II.—NO. IV.

species of Church History, known only to the modern Theology of Germany. It shall be our object to employ the information it contains with an object in view somewhat different from that of the author, but one to which we think his learned researches would justly lead.

We regard Melancthon as one of the best abused men in ecclesiastical history. Luther and Zuingle, whilst they have been a bye-word and a term of reproach in the catholic world, have ever been held in grateful remembrance by their Protestant children generally. Calvin, whilst he has been no less heartily hated by Roman Catholics, and in addition, has been obliged to bear the maledictions of thousands, who were too much obliged to him for their spiritual inheritance, to have treated him so unthankfully, has ever had his more particular adherents, to rally around his standard, and to revere his piety and genius. But neither the Protestant world as such, nor any particular section of it, has as yet placed so firm a barrier around the memory of Melancthon, as has been the case with the illustrious men already alluded to. If his enemies have not been as numerous or as bitter, his friends, though numerous, have not been so enthusiastic and decided as theirs; if the former have been less successful in repudiating his claims to the grateful regard of the Church, the latter by their faint praise have been more successful in giving him a less elevated position in the great Protestant movement, than the case in fact demands. It has been common to represent him as the secretary or amanuensis of Luther, his colleague. That he was a correct, and classic writer, and a thorough linguist, and highly distinguished in these respects is freely admitted, and full praise is accordingly awarded. His spirit, in which of course imperfection could not be lacking, looking benignantly over the tumultuous waves through which the Reformation passed, and seeming to say, Peace, be still, is frequently regarded as having subserved its main purpose, in checking the passions by which Luther and others were unreasonably excited. His learning was of importance mainly as the store-house, from which the heroes of the battle-field drew forth their weapons, burnished and bright, when the heat of the contest gave them no time to prepare themselves. But his merits under this aspect were chiefly of account in giving the principles of the Reformation a suitable form and vesture, although such a position as is ascribed to him, in such an arena, would be an honorable one indeed. The merits of Melancthon, however, we believe, can be shown to be of a higher character,—that he was truly a hero of his own kind in the strife, whose influence has left an impres-



sion on the Church as distinctive as that of others who figured in the field. He might be regarded as an inactive champion, but his standing still, his silence, when the four winds were in commotion, might have had the effect of working results by far more mighty, than if he had entered the field, fully accoutered, and carried on an offensive attack. His spirit might have been working silently and invisibly in the Church, when no person knew from whence it came.

The ground chosen by Melancthon, which he doubtless regarded as the safest for the Protestant Church, he had not fully reached until after the death of Luther. The presence of his friend and colleague was no longer at hand to overawe him, and he was left to develop and unfold more freely the principles of the Reformation. During its first phases he was confessedly carried along in the wake of Luther's spirit; as much, however, by the general current as by Luther himself. All the circumstances of the times were such as to render the developments of Protestantism, if not to some extent erroneous, certainly incomplete. It is remarked by Schiller in his history of the Thirty Years War, that Protestantism was brought to express itself in the Augsburg Confession at a period somewhat unfavorable. The times were as yet not fully matured to secure to Protestantism as a whole all the advantages, which it placed in the hands of its adherents, and he attributes much of their divisions and dissensions to this circumstance.<sup>1</sup> But the first loud explosion had spent its force. Zuingli had died on the field of battle, and Luther has sunk to rest in peace. A second phasis of the Protestant movement appeared. Calvin was formed at the head of the Reformed ranks, directing their interests by his iron-will, whilst Melancthon succeeded Luther in standing and influence, though not without opposition. It was at this period that the spiritual life of Melancthon came to maturity, when he took his position, from which his labors as somewhat peculiar and distinctive, began to tell on the history of the Church down to the present time. Experience and observation on the practical operation of the Protestant principle gave him superior advantages to lay afresh the ground-work of the Reformation, or at least

<sup>1</sup> His language is: The reason of this change (the divided state of Protestantism) is to be sought precisely in the Augsburg Confession itself. This Confession set a positive boundary to the Protestant faith, before the awakened spirit of investigation was prepared to permit such a boundary to be drawn, and the Protestants unknowingly bartered away a part of the advantages which their revolt from the papacy secured to them.

considerably to modify it. Evidence that he felt some inward call of this character appears *pp.* 128, 129, of Galle's book, and at an early day Luther himself thought he might be designed to be the forerunner of Philip, for whom as another Elias, he was to prepare the way. We shall now consider the position of Melancthon, that we may be able to calculate its force on succeeding times.

At first it is known that Melancthon coincided with Luther in his views of the Lord's Supper. It soon became apparent, however, that this did not entirely satisfy his clear and keen logic, as appears from the fact that he began to change and modify his language in expressing it. But his change of views did not become so generally known, nor was it perhaps complete, until after the death of Luther, when his spirit began to breathe a freer air. The view of Calvin, which had already begun to find friends, met his approbation, and he readily adopted it in preference to the one which he had previously entertained. The proof of this is carried out in detail by Galle with much impartiality, and precludes the possibility of a doubt of its correctness, or a surmise, that he entertained a view that mediated between that of Luther and Calvin. During his life-time, he never maintained his altered view in any public document, as he was repeatedly and earnestly entreated to do by Calvin; but abundant evidence of the fact appears in his private letters, and in documents that appeared subsequent to his decease. His friends as well as his enemies, have reprehended him most unmercifully for his silence, and they are accustomed to attribute his conduct to his timidity, and the shattered state of his nerves. This is slanderous, as well as ungenerous. The timid professor at times afraid of his own shadow, had previously at the call of duty, bearded the lion in his own den, and charity would require us to believe, that in this case, he acted from a sense of duty,—that he regarded silence, under the circumstances, as a more effective weapon than speech, however much he might expose himself to the sneers of the wicked and the rebuke of many of the good.

The position of Melancthon on the Eucharist is important in its bearing on subsequent times, from the fact of the cardinal importance of the doctrine itself in the christian system. As something isolated, or separately considered, it is of no more account than many other doctrines of revelation; but it stands in intimate connection with other controlling and primary truths. It is part and parcel of the christian doctrine of our union with God, a subject, which from an early age taxed the intellect of heathen oriental, and occidental sages, in their painful searches

for the truth, and with them became the germinant point of a universe of intellectual creations. In the christian scheme, it has not only thus become germinant; it connects itself further with the doctrine of Christ, the Son of God, our Mediator, and of the Church, a new link in the chain of endless thought, of which the heathen sages knew nothing. Hence our view of the Eucharist will modify our view of religion itself, of Christ, its author, the Trinity and ultimately of the Supreme Being.

The idea of the Church, connected with the doctrine of the Eucharist, as the communion of saints, was a controlling element in the spiritual life of Melancthon. The mere ideal with him did not suffice; he loved the real as its product, and required that this last should appear to prove the existence of the first. He knew well what the Church ought to be, but when he found her still in the land of bondage, he loved her notwithstanding. None of the Reformers looked with so much yearning affection upon the Catholic Church, and appeared to be so reluctant to disbelieve in its revivification as he. In this regard he has been censured, and it may be with justice, as having carried his charity too far. His error was inevitable in a person of a meditative turn of mind, who holds communion with the saints of the past as well as with those of the present. His failure to see the mere round of empty forms, that had taken the place of the living church, disclosed a heart-felt love for the Holy Catholic Church. Affection ever clings to the forms of the lovely deceased, where "beauty lingers," with the hope, though a vain one, that life may again return. The genuineness of his love is indicated by its extending much farther in a contrary direction. Extra Lutheran Protestantism enjoyed it far more freely than the papists. Without compromising with error, he could recognize the lovely form of the Lamb's bride in Switzerland and France, where Luther could see nought but desolation and death. The authority of the Church in matters of faith and practice was felt more powerfully, perhaps, in his case, than with the rest of the Reformers. The eloquent words of Luther respecting the impiety of departing from the universal voice of the Church is often quoted and admired. The frequent appeals of Melancthon to venerable antiquity are more so, when we find them exemplified by a constant regard for the thing itself. He began to waver in his view of the Eucharist, when he discovered that *oral* manducation, was not taught by the earlier teachers of the Church. He then instituted a new examination of the fathers of the Church, and we may suppose with much and painful anxiety. There can be no doubt if consubstantiation could

have been sustained by the authority of the Church, his troubled spirit would have found repose : none would have been more unyielding than he in its defence, nor resisted more firmly than he the Sacramentarians. But the result obliged him to change preconceived views, to differ from old and tried friends, and to subject himself to the charge of fraternizing with his opponents. The great intellect of the sixteenth century, with his hand on the Bible, bowed to the voice of the fathers, addressing him from a distant, dim antiquity. Instead of detracting from his greatness, this ought to be regarded as a feat of moral heroism of the highest character.

The more mature views of Melancthon on Free Will, Predestination, and Grace, are faithfully given by Galle, as also the process through which his mind passed in reaching them. At first, he in common with Luther, occupied as high ground on the subject of predestination, at least inferentially, as did Calvin subsequently. How far Luther modified his views on this subject, no sufficient evidence has as yet been advanced to show. It is said in his latter years, he approved of Melancthon's modifications, though up to the ninth year before his death, he asserted that he delighted most in reading his book, *de servo arbitrio*, written against Erasmus,—equal to high Calvinism, and wished to regard it in connection with his Catechisms, as the only books, with which he wished his name to be identified to posterity. The evidences of Melancthon's variations, showing his independence of Luther, are more numerous, and to the point. He not only retreated from the dizzy position, he once occupied to the Augustinian view, but is represented as having gone still further, as evidenced in the Synergistic controversy, in which he attempted to resist the antinomian tendency of the times. He was never regarded as being chargeable with Pelagianism, but constantly insisted upon the necessity of divine grace in order to salvation, and maintained the impotency of man to effect his own regeneration. He nevertheless attributed a certain degree of freedom to the human will, with the view of satisfying those parts of Scripture, that seem to require it, and extended the call of mercy to men generally. By degrees he threw the subject of Predestination in a manner aside, as transcending the human intellect, and ministering questions of strife, rather than edification. How he attempted to reconcile all the truths, that gather around the everlasting question of human freedom, if he made any attempt at all, does not appear. He prepared no metaphysical system in which these questions were answered, and his views so far as they go to form a system, appear in his practical



works and controversies. His real service to the world consists not so much in any system, which he may have established, as his moderation in granting all the facts in the case, some of which are at times denied by the Calvinistic party, others by their opponents, the Arminians. The Heidelberg Catechism, to which we shall have occasion to advert as modified by his influence, would no doubt have met with his approbation, as a truthful view of the questions referred to. In this form of sound words, the truths, which gave rise to the Calvinistic system are preserved, whilst those, which justified the rise of modern Arminianism are not discarded. It thus presents the only safe platform for the progress of Theology in the direction adverted to.

It could hardly be expected that a religious character so well rounded, and giving so little occasion for Shibboleths as that of Melancthon, should meet with any very deep sympathy in its favor during the sixteenth century. That was a period, when ties that had bound men together for a thousand years snapped asunder as at the touch of fire; then unity and catholicity were thrown more and more into the shade, and the hand that should attempt to bring them into the light, met with stern rebuke. Least of all could it be expected that this should be the case in Saxon-Germany. It required the "thunder-words" of Luther to move that mass of rocky, robust human nature. It was not the evening zephyr, laden with balmy odors from the spirit-land, that could revive that parched soil; it required the bolts of heaven to discharge their contents, to awaken the drooping principles of life. Still Melancthon was not without his adherents during his life-time and subsequently, at Wittemberg and elsewhere. The Philippists and Crypto-calvinists were numerous, and seemed to be in a fair way of carrying everything before them, but the hand of persecution demolished the influence, and Providence ordered that they in patience and silence should await their time.

Along the banks of the Rhine, in a country watered by the Neckar, Melancthon's native land, there resided a numerous population, possessed of genuine German character, except as it was softened by proximity to France, and rendered more susceptible of wholesome influence from abroad. Into this section of country the doctrines of Calvin had made considerable progress, but not under so objectionable a form as in Holland and Scotland. They were modified by the *gemuehtlichkeit* of Germany, and reverence for the Augsburg Confession, or rather, as we may say, by the Melancthonian tendency of the times. Frederick, the Pious, the Palatine Elector, abolished the Lutheran faith,

and substituted in its place, the Calvinistic. With no intention to vary from the Augsburg Confession, he consulted Melancthon, as to the propriety of preparing some suitable book for the instruction of his people in the true faith. Melancthon approved of his design in his Heidelberg Response, celebrated for the obloquy, which it brought down upon him, and for its defining more definitely his own position. The text-book desired, was the Heidelberg Catechism, prepared by Olevianus, and Ursinus, the former a disciple of Calvin, the latter of Melancthon, and published in 1563 with the approbation of a Synod convened at Heidelberg. This is generally reckoned among the Calvinistic formularies of the time; but it has always been regarded as teaching the objectionable parts of Calvinism more by implication, than expressly. One who reads discussions on predestination attentively, may perceive from which of the parties it came, and it may be said of it with truth "thy speech betrayeth thee;" but the granite-pillars upon which the superstructure rests, are so concealed from view, that a casual observer would not suspect their existence, unless from the firmness and solidity of the building itself. But this quiet, unobtrusive form of the Catechism was not such as Calvinism presented in those times in other lands. Elsewhere it was accustomed to push the consequences of its system out to their utmost extremes, and such was the ardor of its adherents, that neither faggot nor sword, could lower its courageous front. It was rather Melancthonian christianity, mingling with, and pervading the Calvinistic system, that gave the German portion of the Reformed Church such an air of easy, peaceful, majestic repose.

In the Palatinate then, Melancthonianism in connection with the Reformed Church, found a genial soil; but it was not confined to this part of Germany: it penetrated other parts of the Empire. In the seventeenth century, the Palatine-Elector was offered the crown of Bohemia, which he unfortunately accepted, and thus gave occasion to the Thirty Years War, one of the longest and bloodiest on record. During its continuance, the Reformed countries suffered most from that papal wrath, which had been kindling for a century, and were obliged for a long time to bear the heat of the day, until the magnanimous Swede, Gustavus Adolphus, came to the rescue of the Protestant faith. At the peace of Westphalia, 1668, Reformed power and influence in Germany lay prostrate. The Palatinate, its classic soil, was one wide scene of desolation, with little prospect of its ever regaining its former standing and influence. It was a righteous dispensation, a parental discipline, to open up a more glorious

future for the faith of its children. My Kingdom is not of this world. John Sigismund, the Elector of Brandenburg had already established the Reformed faith in his dominions, and as that energetic house rose from the command of a mere principality to a place among the great powers of Europe, Calvino-Melancthonian Christianity has raised its head in Germany.<sup>1</sup> In 1817 the Evangelical Church was formed by the king of Prussia out of the old Lutheran and Reformed Churches in his dominions, and his example has been followed in a great portion of the German States. This measure has been represented as the veriest act of tyranny, that has been exercised upon the consciences of men, and opposition has been long and loud. But the sympathies of Germany have ever been in favor of its general tendency, and it could be shown that the soil had been previously prepared for the new Church. The spirit of Melancthon awoke at the Jubilee of the Reformation, as well as that of Luther, and now it claims its rights among the German people. The Evangelical Church carries with it the weight and influence of Germany against the separatistic tendency on the one hand, and Catholic Austria on the other. Her best and most learned men heartily adopt it as their platform, on which they are content to labor, and erect those theological structures, which will endure to the latest period. The *Union* has not as yet been consummated in an internal way, which is moreover something that is more than could be expected. Clashings and collisions reach our ears even beyond the Atlantic, but this is a necessary attendant on every great and earnest effort of the human mind. It is strange, however, that in this country so little is known of the origin and present state of the Evangelical Church. A movement has been going on in Germany for the last quarter of a century, destined in the end to make itself felt to the extreme limits of Protestantism, and we are scarcely in a condition to

<sup>1</sup> The German Reformed Church in this country, whilst it is composed of German Reformed, Swiss Reformed, Huguenotic, and some few Waldensian elements, has preserved its original character, which may be owing to the fact that so many Palatines settled here during the last century. The piety of her communion, where it has had an opportunity to unfold itself, is that which breathes throughout her excellent Catechism,—peace, moderation, forbearance, brotherly love, and an active interest in the church, and cause of Christ generally. Her venerable Synod, now over a hundred years old, in her annual assemblies, usually presents scenes such as Melancthon would delight to witness, and Calvin would approve. At the same time, it is the only body in this country, where delegates from high-toned Lutheran, and high-toned Calvinistic Synods meet in an ecclesiastical capacity.

give the facts in the case. Sublime Melancthonian silence is all this, that can placidly survey the troubled sea of the present, and rest calmly in the future, final result, though it fail to arrest our attention. Of late, it is true, the Theology of the Evangelical Church, has been making its way from country to country, and we in America are beginning to hear something of it, but generally in the Calvinistic world, it is heartily despised, and its honorable parentage is either denied, or traced to the father of lies. Such we hope and believe will not continue to be the case in this our western world.

During the late convulsions in Germany, on a remarkable occasion, Evangelical christianity was called forth by the pressure of the times to the view of the civilized world, when it was seen that it was not altogether that leaden mass of infidelity, which many had surmised, but a living porion of the body of Christ, with all its tender veins and arteries in full play, blooming with beauty. The revolutions of '48, had broken asunder as in a moment all authority, whether in Church, or State. Thrones tottered, crowns fell from their places, and kings were sent into exile. There was another such a revelation of the man of sin, as had been seen in the previous century. The filth of iniquity was laid open, and the earth was filled with the stench. The tongue of the blasphemer was loosened, and Atheism found its organs in high places. Many thought the last day had come—that Satan was loosed for a season. No rescue seemed to be at hand for either Church or State, except in the direct interposition of heaven. Then the united Church rose with the magnitude of the occasion. A convention of over three hundred ministers and laymen, convened at Wittenberg, the home of the Reformation, in the temple which contains the ashes of Luther and Melancthon, to consult respecting the path of duty. A suitable time was spent in prayer and fasting, when a solemn league was formed to resist the inroads of infidelity, and to pay particular attention to the cause of domestic missions. To evangelize and christianize Germany, seemed to be a work so transcendently important and pressing, that other objects were scarcely thought of. As if rebuked by the finger of God, they returned to their homes more firmly bound together than ever, in the determination to seize the land that was still to be possessed. The bands that held this illustrious assembly together were remarkable. They formed no new creed, the labor of half an hour. They chose merely to base themselves on the symbols of the church from the earliest period downwards. On these a platform, broad and firm enough, could be reared to sustain them in their work and labor of love.



The general tendency of the christian Church at the present day, is neither Petrine, nor Pauline, but Johannean, which is but another word, for Melancthonian. Her deepest, most heart-felt voices are for peace, unity, catholicity. She has long carried the cross, and fought in the strife. She now sighs for deliverance, and waits for the crown.

If we examine attentively the course of Theology, we shall observe that it does not flow entirely in the direction of Lutheranism, nor Calvinism as such. In the case of the former, the doctrine of the Lord's Supper offends the christian consciousness; in the case of the latter, the doctrine of predestination, often carried to the verge of fatalism, produces the same effect. With reference to the Eucharist, the age so far as it is christian, inclines towards the Calvinistic platform. Not that its deeper wants are here satisfied, but because it finds firm material on which to build so as to secure the legitimate progress of the Church. The Calvinistic theory of human freedom is loosing ground, and high-toned predestination, though most satisfactory to the naked intellect, is undergoing a softer process before the tribunal of the religious consciousness. This tendency is something distinct from the stale Pelagianism of our day, which can bear no comparison in point of solidity with what may be regarded as a one sided Calvinism. There is another and a more wholesome tendency at work, which is ready to admit a certain species of freedom to the natural will, whilst at the same time, it carefully protects the sovereignty of God and the necessity of divine grace. These two have not been reconciled and made to appear in a consistent system of faith, as in the case of Melancthon, but it is a matter of supreme importance that the necessary data should be granted in order to development in any science. Here again the Melancthonian platform is the safest on which to stand, if we have apprehended it correctly.

The churchly tendency of our times, so far as it is sound and scriptural, is also Melancthonian. Among the many divergent lines of thought which constitute it, proceeding from the same point, we may see one which it is safe for us to pursue. It is truly *protestant* and sufficiently reformatory. It does not feel itself in all cases bound by traditions, that reach back to the Reformation-period, much less by those which are the mushroom growth of the day. It fears not to break the green withes laid upon the strength of the truth, and regards as of little account, the hue and cry of the multitude so generally attendant on an effort at real progress. At the same time as in the case of Melancthon it is ever ready to throw itself back upon antiq-

uity, either to fortify or modify its position by the voice of the past, much as the forest oak strikes his roots deeper into the earth, in proportion, as he elevates his head into the region of the tempest and the storm. This is in accordance with the direction of scripture: "Every scribe which is instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, is like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things *new and old*." As our age is emphatically an age of progress, much more so than any previous one, and as the Church is modified by the spirit around her, how necessary the hallowed influences of the Church of the past, to serve as a counteracting force to the fearful velocity, with which the times are carrying us forward. How strange too does it sound for good men to grow suspicious, and become excited at the very word, antiquity. But midst all the noise and bustle of the present, the meditating, the reflective, the serious can discern the mellowed voices of the ancients, as from a distant shore, waxing louder and louder, as our troublous times seem to require their co-operation in carrying forward the work of God in the world. No species of theological knowledge is beginning to be regarded of more value, than Church History, and in no department of knowledge, have more genius and learning been summoned to the task of satisfying the crying wants of the Church. Our commentaries are beginning to be valued not so much for their novel modes of interpretation, as for the *authority* of any single explanation, and we hope the time is not far distant, when the laity will place the pulpit under similar, wholesome restrictions. And with reference to the present state of our doctrinal Theology, it is being felt by many, that its purification can be encompassed only by its transmission to the head-waters of the Reformation.

In conclusion, we would say, that in the above, we do not intend to disparage any of the Reformers. We regard Luther as the greatest man: Calvin, the greatest Theologian: whilst we regard Melancthon as the greatest christian, and his position as the safest starting-point for the progress of Protestantism, that on which the future universal church is destined to rest. We do not claim for him originality, for all that goes to constitute the ground-work of his life. We regard it as a matter of the highest praise that could be bestowed upon him, that in an excited, agitated age, warding off the influences of party-spirit, he adopted such a full, many-sided view of the Gospel.

*Smithsburg, Md.*

T. A.

## ECCLESIASTICAL TENDENCIES.

[Translated from the "Kirchenfreund."]

It belongs to the peculiar character of our times, that in different lands, on the field of the Protestant Church, a certain retrograde tendency is coming to prevail, materially and plainly different from the views and aims which were entertained even among the pious themselves not a great while since. In Germany, for instance, it had gone so far, that not only was the Church fallen into absolute contempt with open unbelief, affecting at the same time the proud tone of science and superior cultivation; but for those also who professed to adhere to the old faith it was regarded as of force and authority, so far only as it fell in with the current conception of a merely invisible communion. It was frequently said in so many words indeed, that a Christian and a Pietist were two as much like terms, as a Protestant and a Christian or a Pietist and a Protestant. The case was supposable thus, that a man might have no regard for the Church, visibly taken, nay might absolutely hate it, and still be counted, possibly too for this very reason itself, a good christian. The Church as an outward organism, thrown around man's life, seemed to lose almost all significance over against subjective christian experience. Infidelity sought to abstract Christ from the heart; the great interest then, on the other side, was felt to lie in maintaining for the heart the possession of Christ.—The course of things in England and America was much the same. There however it was not so much the inroads of unbelief, as the prevalence of a stiff, dry, moralising orthodoxy, rationalistic too in its own way, which served to call forth a reaction on the part of those who were concerned truly for their salvation. The visible Church, not directly in its forms and ordinances, but in the manner rather in which these were administered, being shorn of their proper life and spirit, could not fail to excite an opposition, to which every established form as such came to appear dangerous, and which also gave itself up to the object of bringing individuals to Christ, in the way of experimental apprehension, as the one great end of religion. The maxim had full acknowledgment, that every one who is in Christ is thereby also in the Church, but not the reverse. That to "be in Christ" however includes more in it than a mere personal experience of salvation, that one who is in Christ is a member of his body, while this body must be not at all something purely inward, but something outward at the same time, an organism embracing

humanity—this seemed to be left entirely out of sight. If danger was escaped thus in one direction, it was only by running into new danger in another. For will inward experience now really become infallible? Shall there be no need more for any forms whatever? May not new ones rise, much worse perhaps than before? May not spiritual coldness again return? Must not the divisions of Protestantism tend to impair its inward strength and truth? Can the old church forms be abandoned, without giving up at the same time doctrines and principles indispensable to sound church life?

History itself has long since answered these questions. And with it many of the friends of christianity, both in the old world and in the new, have come to look upon a piety as of very questionable character, which makes a merit of its own unchurchliness. Hence no idea belonging to the whole range of theology is so much in view latterly as that of the *Church*. And this is altogether right. The Church may be placed not improperly at the head of the entire christian doctrine. By her we know that there is a kingdom of God; by her the Bible is first offered to us as God's word; by her our faith stands in union with the faith of all the saints in the earliest and most remote times. The undervaluation of the visible Church has been carried quite too far. Christianity demands a sound body no less than a healthy soul. The two condition each other. The efforts then which are made to secure closer contact again with the old order, the original spirit, the forms this created for itself in the Reformation, are full of meaning for our time. Their object is to restore the good, which has been thrown away along with the bad in rash attempts at improvement.

The circumstances of the present time are in truth such, that any man who puts forth his strength for the sake of the good, against the reigning spirit of the age, and so not out of selfishness but from a true spirit of love, is at once entitled to thanks, even though his activity should be without plan in a universal view. And with how few can it be otherwise! All should be welcome, that honestly proposes to help the malady of the times. How much too has taken place recently, in the old world as well as in the new, for the invigoration of Protestantism! From the Prussian scheme of Union to the great London Alliance—the cause of Missions, Foreign and Domestic, Bible Societies, the system of Tracts and Colportage, and many other agencies that might be named, are all enterprises of true benevolence, that have already wrought more good than can well be told in single respects. But these enterprises themselves serve in truth



to show us to what point we have come, and the obligation which rests on every friend of the kingdom of God, to build on the broken down walls of Zion, in his own place, according to the best of his knowledge and ability. No one is called at present to the office of a Reformer. But to assist, to improve, to resist the enemy in single places, and to be true to particular trusts ; that is what we must limit ourselves to at this day, and a blessing may be expected to go along with it.

We ought not now to be surprised however, if in this business of patching and improving much may come into view that is not in full harmony with itself. It fares with the spiritual habitation of God here, as it has fared with many houses of God that are made with hands. We have ourselves seen such, which were begun in the old Roman round arch style. Afterwards these simple and noble lines failed any longer to give satisfaction, and were crowded out by fanciful complicated Gothic additions. There came however still another spirit, and the rich pomp of the Gothic architecture was covered over with lime and chalk, to make the worship more spiritual. Even this sober improvement has been forced also to give way to new change, which may be repeated again no one can say how often. Has it not fared in the same way with our Protestant Church? It is the arena, we know, at any rate, for all private opinions, where every one may make trial of his strength.

The efforts of our time to infuse new life into the kingdom of God, and to secure for it a more full and effective entrance into public life, as well as the family sphere, all reduce themselves perhaps to two tendencies. The one aims to reach the general from the single, the other reversely to reach the single from the general. The one lays hold of the individual life, to incorporate it with the organism of the whole ; the other seeks the organization of the whole, in order to subdue the individual life the more easily by means of it to a general end. The first asserts in favor of the individual an independence of christian thought, that owns no necessary allegiance to the past of the Protestant Church ; the second insists on laying down a certain basis of faith and worship, as already established, by which to restrain and hold in check the undue exercise of freedom. The first is historically the older tendency, the second the later and more recent. The old form of Protestantism retained its authority down into the last century, carrying it to petrification ; it had historical right on its side, but its rigid conformation was at last only a sort of paper papacy, and its existence was almost wholly polemical, its very strength lying in controversy not in love.

The last century shows here the most violent revolution. This had many aspects, but its distinctive character is just the assertion of the subjective and individual over against the claims of tradition and law. Thus private judgment stood forward in the Rationalism of Germany, and of other lands, carrying its appeal to the fundamental right of Protestantism itself; but it showed clearly also the entire want of a right understanding between the Protestant confession and individual knowledge. The same assertion of the subjective lies at the ground of German Pictism, English Methodism, and all kindred manifestations. Here indeed no departure from the church faith has been designed; but there was no right understanding again with the reigning form of the church; it failed to serve as a medium between the word of faith and the believing heart. The effect of all this was, and still continues to be, very great. Unbelief on the one side, affecting to believe as it may please and what it may please, has grown into frightful power. This carries in itself no organizing principle, but is decomposing, eats like rust, wherever it is found, spreading itself as a cancer; it sees in the faith of the Church only an overwhelming power, it seeks new principles on which to build the social system, but draws off men from the influence of Christ's word and spirit. Over against it, and yet one with it as regards the over-valuation of the subjective, stands the modern Separatism, with its so plausible pretence of superior piety; which with vast want of all general knowledge invests the feeling of a moment with the value of eternity, and labors under all the defects that attach to such one sided account of feeling, namely lack of genuine moral force in the will, and confusion in the understanding. This sovereignty of the individual will not allow us Protestants, with all our talking, to come to right genuine action; in this country Protestantism has lost a large part of its moral force, its influence over public relations. To this state of things it is owing, that our youth for the most part grows up in the thickest moral and religious darkness; that an insensibility to divine things follows, which no later inward convulsions can ever compensate or cure; that the leading political men lend their favor to the religious body, which promises them the best service; that family love is found to fail, in proportion as that which should be the strongest bond of union is turned into an occasion of difference and separation; that all the enterprises of Protestantism, as a *propaganda fidei*, are made weak by the misery of division; that persons who have no call whatever, without any preparation, devote themselves to the service of the Church, getting honor thus to themselves while the

Church is made to fall to the same extent, with the higher class, in relative dignity and weight ; that along with all, and just because it is thus, the Roman Catholic Church extends her power, and skilfully turns to account the advantage of our weakness as well as of her own compact organization.

Certainly subjectivism has had full time and opportunity among us, to show its strength and bring deliverance. But what has it thus far accomplished ? In the form of rationalism, it has sought to overthrow all the foundations of human society. Under the name of liberalism and light it promotes indifference towards sin, the perennial poisonous fountain of all sorrow, lawlessness, selfishness, the breaking up of all relations by the dissolution of the most sacred ties that bind man to man. In the form of a purely experimental piety, on the other hand, affecting to follow only its own feelings, the same spirit has produced a thousand illusions ; dividing the Church ; and at last flinging itself again, (often in the most odious way,) into the arms of the very evil it rose from at first, namely stiff formality and its accompaniment spiritual death.

And now the question is, whether the tendency which is making itself felt in our day, from different sides, in opposition to this overbearing individualism, is not also reasonable and right ? Those who tell us, from a contrary mind, no regard is had here to personal piety, are either ignorant or malicious. It is just one of the worst signs of our time, a true mark of the curse upon it, that the expression " churchly minded " has passed into a term of reproach. Equally unjust is it, where one shows himself dissatisfied with the existing sect system, its divisions and fanatical disorders, at once to class him with one sided tendencies and views in the opposite direction, or it may be to charge him even with a leaning towards Rome. No, we hesitate not a moment to speak freely what we think. We see that the state of Christianity in our day rests on no other foundation so much as on that of merely natural moral conceptions, which differ heaven-wide from the truths of the kingdom of heaven. Our wish now would be to behold in the Church not simply a sort of cobbling system brought in to mend existing damage, and so to help men forward to heaven ; we would have rather man's life made to rest throughout, without distinction or exception, on the truths of revelation, on God's word and will ; we would have it consecrated and sanctified by religion in all its relations ; so that the Church should lead him from the cradle to the grave ; educate him, and hold him under her discipline through his whole life ; have in her charge the care of the sick, the poor,

the inmates of prisons, and in short all states and conditions. And we say in this case *the Church*, because we know that nothing comes of it when these things are left to the good will or prudence of the individual, where every one in his interpretation of the Bible turns a nose of wax only to suit himself. We wish therefore a Church, and a confession from this Church herself showing what she is in her own mind, and what difference she makes between herself and the Roman papacy, as well as all that may ape this under Protestant form. With this moreover we would not be narrow minded. With Melancthon we should have no objection to some sort of visible head for the Church, as a bond of unity; and we could allow also that difference of view on some points, as for example with regard to the baptism of infants or grown persons, need not lead necessarily to separation and division. But were once such an organization brought about for the Protestant Church, even in this land only, could it only so concentrate its activity and strength, would it not be clothed with immeasurably greater moral influence? Must personal piety in such circumstances fall into neglect? Would not the individual come far more fully under the power of the Church? And would not the opposition to Rome become thus of far more force and effect? The greater the body is which is pervaded by one and the same self-feeling, the greater will be its firmness inwardly and the force of its action without!

When those therefore who seek the promotion of genuine piety in our time, are willing to incur the reproach of a backward tendency, rather than receive as pure gold the outside show of a religion that resolves itself into mere feeling, they have the experience of a whole century in their favor. That is just the misery of our age, that when one fancies himself to have had some inward *experience* of religion, he is ready at once to take himself for a new man altogether, mounts the seat of counsel, has nothing more to learn, and will not allow even the preacher to know a whit more of the kingdom of God and the Church than himself. Nay, the preachers, by a flattery that proceeds from the lowest motives, confirm such persons in their spiritual pride and blindness; there is dishonesty behind on both sides. We acknowledge, however, no ecclesiastical aristocracy; while we acknowledge just as little also an ecclesiastical democracy. We have in the whole world no conservative institution but the Church. So we regard it in the form also of Protestantism. The Church came not forth from that process of purification, in a period of storm and trial, to fluctuate from that time onward



on the waves of individual passing opinion. It was just the devices and additions of men she sought to cast aside. What has been found a source of blessing in all ages however, what can never cease to satisfy the necessities of the soul, that wherein was deposited the clear wisdom of the ancient fathers, and their knowledge of the way of salvation, all this she has never cast aside. It never entered into the mind of the Reformers, that either rationalistic or spiritualistic radicalism could ever become the reigning spirit of the age, as it has been for some time past. When they formed confessions accordingly, and liturgies, from the old treasures of the Church, they did it in obedience to what was felt to be the necessity of their circumstances and because they could not entertain the thought that without these means of consolidation and protection a Church could so stand, as not to be exposed to the greatest danger in regard both to doctrine and worship. Did the Reformers however for this reason undervalue personal religion, the true inward experience of faith? Who has more carefully or wisely regarded the old usages of the Church, who has more respected her discipline, who has done more for the organization of the church, for schools, for instruction, for every conservative interest in short, than Luther? And yet who at the same time has gone beyond this same Luther in the life of faith, in the deep experience of the power of the law and of grace in his own soul?

Those who throw suspicion on the Church spirit, and with more or less clear consciousness lean towards the subjective extreme in religion, seeing in sectarianism, excitement and enthusiasm, more good always than evil, are ever ready to apprehend that a dead outward formality must soon come to prevail in the Church, if a certain commotion be not constantly in force to hold it at bay. Most certainly an empty formality will come in, where the ministers look more how many members they have in their flocks for themselves, than how many they have for Christ; where they must have recourse to other means than the sword of the Spirit, to keep their place and situation; where they thrust their own dear self into the foreground, and make that the motive to interest and feeling; where altogether they are bad representatives of the gospel. But have these evils been removed by fanaticism and the sect spirit? If indifference and levity were great before, they have at least served to bring to equal greatness also spiritual pride, uncharitable judgement, hypocrisy and sham holiness. But is living piety then irreconcilable with adherence to the old order and custom of the Church? Were then the composers of our most admirable church prayers and

church hymns spiritually dead men? The most of them were as far as possible removed from indifference to the forms and institutions of the Church, by far the greater part of them lived in a time of the most rigid orthodoxy, held themselves closely to the observances of the Church, and yet—how did they pour forth the richest strains from their full hearts! And is their number then so small? Or was there at that time so little faith in the old world? No, but rather at the present time; and unless the Church come together as a body of believers, consolidate itself better, seek to organize itself collectively as one, and constitute thus a great moral power, where the individual must make less of his private judgment than before, the case is not likely soon to improve. And yet how unfair often are the warm opponents of the old church spirit and practice! We have ourselves once heard a ranter, who railed out with all his might upon the dead formality and letter worship of the Church, and had singing at the same time along with his service from three old German genuine *church hymns*, composed by men of true church spirit! That is to rob a man's house, and scold him soundly into the bargain!

If we take all these things into view, if we consider the necessities of the time, the quack remedies of modern invention, the dangers that press from within and without, the state of our preachers, the existing confusion of Christ's flock, we may with certainty affirm that to go back to the old church order in doctrine, worship and practice is not to be guilty of any defection from christianity but to fulfil towards it a sacred duty; that it is in truth the way pointed out by the relation in which we stand to the period and work of the Reformation, for us to carry forward the work of Zion, not by novelties, but in the spirit and sense of the Reformation itself, and on its foundation as laid in the truth of the Holy Scriptures. And that the eyes of many in our day are beginning to open, and inquiry is heard after the genuine and the old, that the ancient treasures of the Church and its confessions are drawn forth from the midst of rubbish and dust, that the wisdom of the age is coming in much to be regarded by many as foolishness before God, all this is to us highly significant as we look forward full of hope towards a greater future of the Church.

*Philadelphia.*

W. J. M.

## MODERN ENGLISH AND SCOTTISH BALLADS.

I love the old English ballad especially because it is perhaps entirely of Teutonic origin; or, if of the Celtic spirit it may have inherited something, it has certainly nothing of the old Roman about it. It came not down from the classic times of antiquity. It was not the offspring of ancient Italy or Greece. It was not introduced into England from Normandy or France. "Ingulphus the secretary of William the Conqueror," says Campbell in his admirable Essay on the Poetry of his country, "speaks of the popular ballads of the English in praise of their heroes, which were sung about the streets; and William of Malmsbury, in the twelfth century, continues to make mention of them." During the depression of its Saxon people this species of song, no doubt, languished for a while; but we cannot think that its notes became ever wholly mute. While by the chantings of the lordly Romance, introduced from Normandy, the halls of the barons were enlivened, at the same time, by the simpler strains of the old ballad, we may naturally suppose, were still cheered the firesides of the peasantry. While from its two component parts, the Norman and the Saxon, the English language was being formed, this latter species of composition, no doubt, received much refinement and polish, and perhaps rhyme itself, from abroad, but with all its improvements it lost not its original elements. In the higher departments of literature, Romantic poetry, translated from other countries, brought with it into England many of its foreign expressions and idioms, whereby the language was enriched; but the old ballad still clung as fondly as it could to the national Saxon.

The poet Gray, in his Remarks on the Poems of Lydgate, says: "About the middle of the fourteenth century our tongue, with all its rudeness, had acquired an energy and plenty by the adoption of a variety of words borrowed from the French, the Provençal and the Italian, which at this day our best writers seem to miss and regret; for many of them have gradually dropped into disuse, and are only now to be found in the remotest counties of England." In turning over the leaves of Chaucer, however, who was flourishing about the middle of the fourteenth century, or very soon afterwards, notwithstanding his having caught much of his inspiration from Provence and Italy, of those words of his, nevertheless, which have, since his day, grown obsolete, we will be apt to meet with full as many of Saxon descent as of Norman or French introduction; wherefore those

best writers mentioned above, we are disposed to think, would have shown as much patriotism and better taste had they grieved not so much on account of the denial of naturalization to some unworthy aliens as on account of the disfranchisement of many native expressions removed to make room for the denizens. At any rate, for the loss of these foreign words, Gray himself, we feel certain, was not much distressed, as in English Literature he stands forward prominent in a new school of poetry in his day, distinguished for its chasteness and simplicity of style, which was very much advanced, (as already stated, page 158 of this vol.) by Dr. Percy through the publication of his *Relics of Ancient Poetry*. By another school, however, these phrases, now obsolete, from foreign sources, may have been missed and regretted, we admit, whose fault it was to employ as few as possible, in their writings, of those true Norman and Saxon words which had entered radically as component parts into the construction of English, and to seek after as many as possible of later modes of expression introduced, from time to time, from the Latin and Greek, after the language had been thoroughly formed and fixed; whose ornate style, in the time of Gray, had Dr. Johnson carried to perfection. That this, however, was an unnatural affectation of the times, and not in accordance with appropriate feeling, is apparent from the custom of Dr. Johnson himself, who, being possessed of a true English heart, notwithstanding his peculiarities, could not always help, as manifested in his letters and conversation, expressing himself, under his first impulses, in proper Saxon. Well set forth is this by Macaulay in his *Criticism on Boswell's Life of Johnson*: "It is clear," he says, "that Johnson himself did not think in the dialect in which he wrote. The expressions which came first to his tongue were simple, energetic and picturesque. When he wrote for publication he did his sentences out of English into Johnsonese. His letters from the Hebrides to Mrs. Thrale are the original of that work of which the *Journey to the Hebrides* is the translation; and it is amusing to compare the two versions. 'When we were taken up stairs,' says he in one of his letters, 'a dirty fellow bounced out of the bed on which one of us was to lie.' This incident is recorded in the *Journey* as follows: 'Out of one of the beds on which we were to repose, started up, at our entrance, a man black as a Cyclops from the forge.' Sometimes Johnson translated aloud. 'The Rehearsal,' he said very unjustly, 'has not wit enough to keep it sweet;' then after a pause, 'it has not vitality enough to preserve it from putrefaction.' "



Such lines as these ;—

“ I put my hat upon my head  
And walked into the Strand,  
And there I met another man  
Whose hat was in his hand,”—

frabricated by Dr. Johnson with the malign intent of casting ridicule on the simplicity of ballad poetry, are calculated rather, I apprehend, to set forth its excellence. Puerile they are, I admit, to some extent, but nevertheless picturesque. Embellished with an appropriate woodcut they might serve as a very handsome addition, in the way of a first reading lesson, to the Child's New England Primer. They are not poetic, to be sure, on account of the persons described being devoid of passion or striking incident ; but that surely is not to be laid to the charge of the Saxon. The blame, if any, must rest wholly on the imagination of the composer. The language itself is perfectly pellucid and shews the picture in its true colors. The fault lies in the figures themselves, being too prosaic in their attitudes. The Johnsonese, on the other hand, resembleth stained glass. By the grandeur of the diction itself our vision is too apt to be arrested ; and at first sight we are not just fully able to discern whether beneath it is concealed any thing very important or not.

Against the Scottish dialect, which is well adapted for ballad poetry, it seems to me that English poets and critics have always been possessed, more or less, with an unwarrantable prejudice. The native genius of the Scottish bards they are apt enough to acknowledge, but they generally find fault with their phraseology. Thus Blair in his Lectures pronounces, as he ought, Allan Ramsay's Gentle Shepherd equal to any pastoral in any language, but he regrets its being written in the old rustic dialect of Scotland, which, he says, in a short time will probably be entirely obsolete and not intelligible. Again, Cowper, on the first publication of Burns' Poems, in a letter to Samuel Rose, Esq., admits at once the high merits of the poet, but thinks it a pity if he should not thereafter divest himself of barbarism and content himself with writing pure English, in which to him he appears perfectly qualified to excel. Campbell too ; what is still more surprising, in whose time the idiom of the Scottish language, on account of the worth of the bards who used it, had become more studied and better understood in England, as it still continues to be, in his Specimens of the British Poets, while he eulogizes Burns in the highest terms, yet affirms, at the same time, that

the fire of his wit and passion was enabled to glow through an *obscure dialect* only by its confinement to short and concentrated bursts. Now the truth is, the genius of Burns could not have found its full expression through any other mode of speech. Instead of repressing his inspired emotions the Scottish dialect served rather, like the wings of his own Pegasus, to carry him more joyfully and freely through the fields of nature. In every language a broad dialect is natural to rural life and manners, degenerating into rudeness sometimes, it is true; but that of Scotland, on account of the wild and romantic scenery of the country, which impresses the people, has acquired and still retains a charming simplicity and mellowed pathos. In some counties of England the rude speech of her common-people is a perversion, and in some sections of our own country the cant phrases, which it is often attempted to introduce into our literature, should be kept out and frowned upon as innovations, calculated, if admitted, to unnerve our speech; but in Scotland the dialect is no upstart nor provinciality. It has grown up gradually with the history of the country, and its beauties are inseparably blended with her national literature. In its vocabulary are contained many old Saxon words of sterling worth that have unluckily fallen out from the English. Thus the language of the Scotch remains more vigorous and complete. Besides its copiousness too, by the custom of lopping off many of the final consonants of words, and the changing and softening down of the vowels into soundings more like those of Italian than of English, the shackles of rhyme are rendered less constraining to the poet. Not like a strait-jacket, the language confines his thoughts, but like an easy costume, bracing them up sufficiently and falling around them in becoming folds. Though debarred, as the dialect ought to be, from the higher departments of verse, it is admirably adapted for ballad poetry, pastorals and, to some extent, lyrical pieces; in which respect it very much resembles the Doric of the Greeks, which was also used, not in their ballads, to be sure, for of these they had none, but in their *Bucolics* and, to some extent, in their odes and choral songs:

Lyric and ballad poetry are often confounded and by some considered the same; but, though the style of the one may occasionally merge into that of the other, their characteristics are certainly marked and distinct. The lyric is more animated and varied, depending, in a great measure, on its accompanying music for its full execution; and on that account it may be said to address itself rather to the imagination of the ear. The ballad, on the other hand, is more composed, relying more on its

graphic pictures for its moving effect than on any accompanying melody of its own ; and on this account it may be said to address itself rather to the imagination of the eye. The lyric delights often to clothe itself in words of Norman hue or in those of later importation ; the ballad, as said before, prefers the Saxon. The one, in impassioned strains, gives full expression to its feelings, and thus excites, if it can, the audience at once and carries them along with it. The other calmly depicts the incidents of the scene, vividly and pathetically, to be sure, but with all utterance of those high emotions, which the case might seem to demand, suppressed ; on which account, by a sort of revulsion of feeling, the listener often becomes more affected than even the narrator or person he represents in the ballad appears to be himself. Thus, in *Auld Robin Gray*, Jenny expresses herself in subdued sorrow, to be sure, throughout, but without any high excitement. Against her old gudeman she never utters a word of disrespect. She always speaks of him kindly. Yet when Lady Ann Lindsay, who composed the piece, as she tells us, to try its merits, read it, before publication, to a country laird or farmer, I forget which, on listening to the lines :

“ He had na been away a week, but only twa,  
When my mither she fell sick, and our cow was stoun awa ;  
My father brake his arm, and my Jamie at the sea,  
And Auld Robin Gray came a courtin me.” —

“ The villain ! ” he exclaimed indignantly, “ I ken wha stole the coo ! It was Auld Robin Gray himsel’.” In Scotland, however, the ballad, perhaps partly owing to her wilder natural scenery, which affects the manners, is more apt to rise into something of a lyrical strain than in England. William Motherwell, the Scottish poet, in the ballad style of writing is surpassed by few ; his compositions of this kind are pervaded throughout by a genuine simplicity and touching pathos ; yet even in these we meet occasionally with a trait or two more properly belonging to the ode. Take an extract from his *Jeanie Morrison* :

“ My head rins round and round about,  
My heart flows like a sea,  
As ane by ane the thochts rush back  
O’ scule-time and o’ thee.  
Oh, mornin’ life ! oh, mornin’ luvie,  
Oh, lechtsome days and lang,  
When hinnied hopes around our hearts  
Like simmer blossoms sprang.

“ Oh, mind ye, luvie, how aft we left  
 The deavin’ dinsome toun,  
 To wander by the green burnside,  
 And hear the waters croon ?  
 The simmer leaves hung ower our heads,  
 The flower burst round our feet,  
 And in the gloaming o’ the wood  
 The throssil whusslet sweet.

“ The throssil whusslet in the woods,  
 The burn sang to the trees,  
 And we, with nature’s heart in tune,  
*Concerted harmonies ;*  
 And on the knowe abune the burn  
 For hours thegither sat,  
 In the silentness o’ joy till baith  
 Wi’ very gladness grat.

“ Aye, aye, dear Jeanie Morrison,  
 Tears trickled down your cheek,  
 Like dew-beads on a rose, yet nane  
 Had ony power to speak !  
 That was a time, a blessed time,  
 When hearts were fresh and young,  
 When freely gushed all feelings forth,  
*Unsyllabled—unsung !*

“ I mavel, Jeanie Morrison,  
 Gin I have been to thee,  
 As closely twined wi’ early thochts  
 As ye hac been to me.  
 Oh ! tell me gin their music fills  
 Thine ear as it does mine—  
 Oh ! say gin e’er your heart grows grit  
 Wi’ dreamings o’ lang syne ?

“ I’ve wandered east, I’ve wandered west,  
 I’ve borne a weary lot ;  
 But in my wanderings far and near  
 Ye never were forgot.  
 The fount that first burst frae this heart  
 Still travels on its way,  
 And *channels* deeper as it rins  
 The luvie o’ life’s young day.”

In the long syllabled English words, of Latin or Greek deri-



vations, occurring above among the native Doric, is shewn, we think, a lurking disposition to rise into the lyric. This we mention not as a defect but as a peculiarity of modern Scottish ballad-mongers. The inclination, in the present case, was perhaps partly acquired by the poet from his admiration and study of Burns, whose impassioned genius, however, sought and found its proper expression, not through the unaffected ballad, but through the more spirited ode or song. In the last stanza, at any rate, the appropriate figure employed was certainly suggested by this passage from the apostrophe of the earlier bard to his Mary in Heaven:

“Still o’er these scenes my mem’ry wakes,  
And fondly broods with miser care!  
Time but the impression deeper makes,  
As streams their channels deeper wear.”

Lyrics are generally considered of a superior order to ballads: and no doubt, my reputation for good taste is risqued in the announcement, but I must say that I am disposed to think the reverse should be the case. My disposition in this respect, I admit, may be partly attributed to my latent, natural, musical abilities not having been sufficiently cultivated in my youth, but still I flatter myself I have something of nature on my side when I assert that I am often more moved by an unpretending ballad than by the highest lyrical rhapsodies; when I own that I am frequently more affected, for instance, by some such simple melody as this from a warm hearted son of Erin than by your wildest dirges or most passionate laments:

“I’m sitting on the stile, Mary,  
Where we sat side by side,  
On a bright May morning long ago,  
When first you were my bride;  
The corn was springing fresh and green,  
And the lark sang loud and high,  
And the red was on thy lip, Mary,  
And the love-light in your eye.

“The place is little changed, Mary,  
The day is bright as then;  
The lark’s loud song is on my ear,  
And the corn is green again!  
But I miss the soft clasp of your hand,  
And your breath, warm on my cheek,

And I still keep listening for the words  
You never more may speak.

“ ’Tis but a step down yonder lane,  
And the little church stands near—  
The church were we were wed, Mary,  
I see the spire from here ;  
But the grave-yard lies between, Mary,  
And my step might break your rest,  
For I’ve laid you, darling, down to sleep,  
With your babe upon your breast.

“ I’m very lonely, now, Mary,  
For the poor make no new friends ;  
But O ! they love the better, far,  
The few our Father sends !  
And you were all I had, Mary,  
My blessing and my pride ;  
There’s nothing left to care for now,  
Since my poor Mary died !

“ I’m bidding you a long farewell,  
My Mary—kind and true !  
But I’ll not forget you, darling,  
In the land I’m going to !  
They say there’s bread and work for all,  
And the sun shines always there,  
But I’ll not forget old Ireland,  
Were it fifty times as fair.

“ And often in those grand old woods  
I’ll sit and shut my eyes,  
And my heart will travel back again  
To the place where Mary lies ;  
And I’ll think I see the little stile  
Where we sat side by side,  
On a bright May morning long ago,  
When first you were my bride !”

In this ballad only three words of Norman-French derivation occur: *changed*, *grand* and *travel*, but their places could not be well supplied by any Saxon synonyms. The word *travel* is especially appropriate, as along with its proper meaning it has associated with it also the idea of distance and something like trouble of heart. Such instances evince that the Saxon and Norman in the English are not two distinct languages in them-

selves. They cannot be untwined, like the lily or white rose from the red ; but like the blending of the hues of those plants, which Cowper speaks of, on the cheeks of the British Fair, their union is organic and complete. Of ballad poetry the Muse is a perfect blond, her eyes blue, her hair flaxen (though to the Scottish fancy she reveals herself with dark eyes and yellow hair) and in her guise as unassuming as was the Lady Clare that Tennyson sets forth, when she had doffed her ornaments:

“She clad herself in a russet gown,  
She was no longer Lady Clare:  
She went by dale, and she went by down,  
With a single rose in her hair.”

The incidents she meets with she depicts in touching simplicity of language without any garish decorations. A trait or two, however, of her lineage having been derived, in a slight degree, from a Southern clime, at times she manifests. Not always remains her manner outwardly composed. In proper fits her minstrelsy becomes somewhat animated and even passionate. The lilies of her cheek are not always most apparent, but across them comes occasionally also the warmer flush of the Norman or Provencal rose.

*Mercersburg, Pa.*

W. M. N.

#### BIBLE CHRISTIANITY.

1. *The Bible Alliance : or the Pen, the Pulpit, and the Press.* By T. H. Stockton.—Nos. 1–7. Cincinnati: 1850.
2. *The Unity and Faith of the Christian Church. A Discourse preached at the Dedication of the New Hall, corner of 23rd St. and 8th Avenue, New York, May 6, 1849.* By Austin Craig. Stereotype edition—Tenth thousand. New York: 1850.

Both of these publications are devoted to the same object. They take the ground, that the existing sect system in the Church is antichristian ; and that the only proper remedy for it, is an open abandonment of all sectarian distinctions, so far at least as they are in any way exclusive, on the part of the true followers of Christ, and a free reconstruction of the christian life on the broad and open platform of the Bible. They represent in this

way a tendency, which at this time particularly is by no means confined to themselves ; a tendency that may be said rather to lie deeply imbedded in the spirit of the age, as it finds vast encouragement also in the general growing ecclesiastical misery of the age ; the working of which well deserves the careful attention and study of all, who would rightly understand, or estimate to purpose, the true import of the Church Question. A circular was issued a short time since, calling a convention to meet at Canandaigua, N. Y., for the special purpose of considering the question, Whether all sectarian distinctions are not unchristian, and at the same time a vast social evil which ought to be abolished? Such public demonstrations reveal only to a small extent the difficulty that is coming to be felt on this subject, by hundreds and thousands throughout the land, who yet shrink from openly avowing what they feel, because they see no clear way of escape from their own embarrassment. We have besides various *sects*, the Winebrennerians, Campbellites, and others, (altogether a numerous body,) which started at least on the principle here offered to our view ; however they may seem to have been drawn themselves again, in their subsequent history, as fully as others, into the same great vortex that has been denounced by them as so dreadful in the case of all sects besides. It is to these mainly, we presume, that Mr. Craig refers, when he tells us, "there are already in the United States and in England some hundreds of thousands who *profess* to be occupying the same ground" that is assumed by the worshippers at the New Hall, lately dedicated in N. York.

Most of our readers probably have some knowledge of the Rev. Thomas H. Stockton. It is generally known too, that for several years past, he has been wrestling in his own way with the problem of Christian Union, endeavoring to effect a concert of worship and action among the different sects, though still retaining his membership and ministry in the Protestant Methodist body. His zeal in this cause has been all along of the most pure and noble character, and such as to entitle him to the admiration and respect of all who love the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. He is a man whom we have long regarded with sincere christian sympathy and affection, though it has never been our privilege to know him personally. We honor him for his self-sacrificing protest against the sect system, and the untiring ardor with which he has been struggling for years to assert in opposition to it the proper liberty of Christ's Church. His soul has been kindled into flame with the ideal of what he calls *Bible Christianity* ; an interest clearly distin-



guishable in his view from the creeds, and confessions, and corporate associations, of the different sects; which all sects are bound accordingly to acknowledge practically as their joint heritage, in a brotherly way and with a regard surpassing their sense of sectarian separation; and to whose service, in such view, he has felt himself bound to consecrate property, health, life, and worldly credit, with a devotion equal to that of any missionary on his chosen field. He was not content to theorize merely, but labored to bring something to pass; gave his time and talents to the work; brought to bear upon it his popularity in the pulpit, and his dexterity with the pen; established a periodical, the "*Christian World*;" proposed a Common Christian Society, Chapel, and Press; sought the approbation of distinguished men in Church and State; and so long as it stood in words and fair speeches only, gained actually to his cause nearly all the backing in this form that he was pleased to ask. "While others were repairing to Washington, from all quarters" he tells us, "for the promotion of political purposes, (a. 1845,) I made a call upon the President and Vice President, elect, who were waiting for the day of Inauguration, and received their signatures in behalf of BIBLE CHRISTIANITY. To these were added others, from Congress, the Supreme Court, and the Post Office Department; and to these, after a while, about a hundred and forty more, from Ministers of the Gospel—Baptist, Presbyterian, Independent, Protestant Episcopal, Lutheran, and Methodist Protestant." Who could refuse, politician or ecclesiastic, to give his *name* at least, if nothing more, in favor of Bible Christianity? Mr. Stockton labored on, more or less in the fire, "hand and heart full of toil and anxiety;" with far less headway than he could have wished. In January, 1847, the *Christian Athenaeum* was opened "at No. 40, N. 4th St., Philadelphia; in a small way, but not without hope of increase." In April, 1847, the *Christian Society of Brotherly Love* was organized; embracing some who had never been in any church fellowship, and others "connected with *fourteen different Denominations*." The whole movement however was still most uncomfortably crippled, to the feeling of Mr. Stockton, by the supremacy allowed on all sides to these sectarian distinctions. Towards the close of the same year we find him settled in Cincinnati, full as ever of his amiable fixed idea, and teeming with projects and plans for carrying it into at least partial execution. Thus originated, *The Ladies' Committee of Instruction and Relief*; then the *Young Men's Reading Class*; then the *Good Boys' Band*. A Prospectus was issued for a periodical, to be styled *The Let-*

ter Press ; and a proposition followed to establish a *Bible College*, "in the midst of the People and for the People." The following record is characteristic. "June 3 : 1848 :—Spent the evening over Robert Hall's works : still seeking to understand the subject of False Authority in the Visible Church of Christ. In all these investigations, am deeply persuaded of the supreme importance of *faith in Christ* ; the *baptism* of the Holy Ghost ; *love to God and man* ; and the *freedom* of the *Ministry* and the *People*, in a Church duly honoring the *Bible* and *Private Judgment*, to the glory of God and the good of the world." In March, 1849, Mr. Stockton received a call to the Presidency of Miami University. There was something pleasant, he acknowledges," in the notion of finding time to issue a series of *American 'OXFORD TRACTS'*—not devoted, like the English series, to Puseyism, or the Newmanism, as some call it, but to the Old Glory of the Christianity of the New Testament shining through the Transfiguration of the Church of the New Testament." But still the invitation, for good reasons, was declined ; and the champion of Bible Christianity went on as before, preaching and working as the Pastor of the Sixth St. Station, with one foot in the Methodist Protestant Church and the other foot fairly on the outside. A most uncomfortable sort of dualism, not easy to support either in walking or working. Finally, in the way of compromise, he proposed in form to open a new church, (without forsaking the old one,) where he might be free from all denominational trammels at least with half his ministry ; consenting to bear them still in the other half of it, and offering to relinquish at the same time one half of his salary, for the privilege of such partial freedom. The congregation was supposed to be itself deeply committed to the interest of Bible Christianity ; but this seemed to be going too far ; and the denominational spirit was roused at once into an attitude of remonstrance and rebellion. Mr. Stockton however refused to bow any farther to its demands ; having been held back too long already, in his own opinion, from a *whole* consecration to undenominational Christianity ; and we find him accordingly, since last December, preaching and working in a fully independent way, in the bosom of the Church general, without ecclesiastical patronage or help from any quarter. No account seems to have been taken of this irregularity in the body to which he belonged. He professes to belong to it still ; only taking his ministry into his own hands, and placing himself for the exercise of it under the guidance of the Bible, instead of the Quarterly M. P. Conference. The "Bible Alliance" is intended to give to a wider public, the preparations of

his pen delivered in the first place, as addresses or sermons, from the pulpit. The whole movement looks to the establishment in due time, of a *Bible Church*, a *Bible School*, a *Bible Asylum*, and a *Bible Press*; by which several interests, it is hoped, some proper beginning may be made towards the actualization of true Bible Christianity, in the way of needful supply for the natural, intellectual and spiritual wants of the world.

Of Mr. Craig's ecclesiastical history we have no knowledge. His location is Peapack, Somerset Co., in the State of New Jersey. The Religious Society, in whose service his sermon now before us makes its appearance, is not willing to be regarded, he tells us, as the nucleus of a *new sect*. It believes, "that God has but *One Church*; to which belong all who have submitted to him, and are striving to do his will." No sect then can be recognised as this Church, because no one is co-extensive with the entire discipleship of Christ. For the same reason, because there is but *one faith*, no particular sect can have this to itself alone in its separate confession or creed. "*We acknowledge the Bible*," says Mr. Craig, "as the *sole authority* in all matters of christian faith and life;" which amounts to a real distinction, he tells us, from nearly all the religious denominations in the world; as notwithstanding the familiar watchword, *The Bible alone is the Religion of Protestants*, it is but too notorious that every sect has its own rule of faith besides this, to which it requires assent and submission as the price of full christian brotherhood. The Church needs no such legislation; *Christ only* has a right to draw up articles of faith, or to make laws, for his people. "The moment a man takes upon himself to dictate to his fellow man what he must find in the Bible, and what he must not find there; that moment he receives the mark of the prophetic *Man of Sin*. The man who makes a creed, or draws up a summary of articles of faith, and says to his brother, *Subscribe these articles, or I will not fellowship you*, whoever he be, whether the Pope of Rome or a Protestant Minister, that man has usurped the throne of the lawgiver, and is Antichrist." This is the right of private judgment, certainly, to some purpose. "It is awful," says the New Hall preacher, "to meddle with the Word of God. That Word is the power of God unto salvation. The destiny of present and unborn millions is suspended upon it. God in his infinite wisdom has given us the amount of truth which the world needs; and he has given it in the best and most useful form. Man has no right either to change the faith of the Church, or to alter its form. Not only are the doctrines of the Word giver of God,

but the form in which those doctrines are presented is also of God. Had God known that his truth could be more useful to some of his creatures in another form—say for instance in the form of the Presbyterian or Methodist creed—he would no doubt have given it in that form. But he has not. On the contrary, he commands us to receive and preserve his words in the form which he has given. ‘Hold fast the FORM of sound words,’ writes the Apostle to his friend and fellow laborer, Timothy. The form in which the *one faith* of Christ’s Church is embodied, is authoritative and divine. Neither individuals, nor churches, nor synods, nor presbyteries, nor conferences, nor councils, have anything to do with the ‘one faith’ of Christ’s Church, except to obey it.”—*P.* 11. Creeds, in the view of this system, are always wrong. They add to the Bible, or leave something out, wronging its authority seriously in either case. They are of the nature of chains moreover, such as the mind of one age has no right to impose on the mind of another. They stand in the way of freedom and progress; and it is a duty accordingly which the christian world owes to itself, to burst them asunder wherever they come in its way. A new era in this respect is proclaimed as near at hand. The very spirit which has seemed to some good men in Europe as the coming of Antichrist, or the letting loose of Satan, is hailed by Mr. Craig as the most favorable distinction of the age. “The Church is coming up from the wilderness! Who can doubt it? Compare the last half century with any of its predecessors since the Primitive Age. How striking and peculiar its characteristics! Look at its unprecedented progress, its mental activity, &c.—Truth-loving men are multiplying; they dare to question the dogmas which in darker times men feared to touch, and now the hoary errors are descending to the tomb. The conflict of the sects has come, and they are performing their God-appointed work of mutual annihilation. The enlightened and the good of all sects, are forgetting their sectarian distinctions and approaching each other in love. They are the Army of Reform. Upon their banners are inscribed PROGRESS and BROTHERHOOD.”—*P.* 20.

It is hardly necessary for us to say, that we allow a certain measure of reason and right to this “Undenominational Christianity,” as we find it arrayed here against the reigning *sect system* of the modern Protestant world. We too hold this system to be a great evil. In a special tract on the subject, (“Antichrist, or the Spirit of Sect and Schism”—N. Y. 1848), we have taken pains to show, that it forms indeed, in conjunction with its natural counterpart Rationalism, the very power of the



antichristian apostacy itself, as described by St. John, under its present Protestant form. It is against the Bible of course ; but only as it is, before that, against the life and constitution of Christianity, as this comes before us in Christ. The unity of the Church flows, not simply from the appointment of Christ, but from his nature ; and it is not possible for it to be denied, accordingly, either theoretically or practically, without a denial at the same time, openly or by implication, of the proper mystery of the Incarnation. This mystery is the real, and not simply *docetic*, “coming of Christ in the flesh ;” his entrance truly into the general order of man’s life ; the incorporation of his higher nature, by indissoluble bond, with the substance of humanity in its universal view. Such a relation implies necessarily a deeper and more comprehensive force, than all that the world is found to possess in the way of power besides. It must underlie and rule, so far as it is rightly acknowledged, all other relations. No distinctions and divisions then can hold fairly among men, which are not carried in the bosom of this unity, the sense of what Christ is as the inmost and last meaning of man’s life, the sum and comprehension of the world’s history. Let the individual reason affect to make *itself* the fulcrum of truth, on the outside of Christ, measuring and settling in such extrinsic style the truth of his mission, or the credibility of his doctrine, and we have at once *Rationalism* in proper form. Let the individual will take the lead in the same way, and the result will be the development of *Sect*. In either case, the true universalness of Christ, the sense of Christianity as the real *whole* of our moral being, is subordinated to what in its own nature is but an inferior interest ; the greater is made to serve the less ; the “obedience of faith” sinks into the character of a mere satellite to authority under some other form. Antichrist in this way takes the place of Christ ; speaking in his name, and pretending to represent his person ; but in truth substituting for his actual presence falsely another conception altogether, and thus turning the mystery of the incarnation into a Gnostic figment. The sect *principle*, the idea of religion that leads to sects and justifies them as right and good, carries with it constitutionally this antichristian character. It may be joined with much that is good, but it is still in its own nature bad always and opposed to Christ. It is against the whole theory of Christianity. The conscience of the whole Christian world secretly condemns it ; and where it may appear to be defended, it will be found always that regard is had in the case to some other interest rather than to the proper honor of Christ and his gospel. The truth is

however, as we all know that even the appearance of any such defence under a direct and open form, is for the most part carefully avoided. Our religious literature, together with our ecclesiastical policy, may be said to connive largely at the evil, quietly assuming its necessity, and frowning into silence all discussion of its merits as unprofitable, "agitation;" but neither of these interests is prepared ordinarily still, to give its weight openly and fully in favor of what is thus allowed. What theologian would risk his credit, by writing a book in vindication of the sect system? Who thinks of signalizing himself in this way, even by a tract or an article in one of our more respectable reviews? What minister feels it expedient to plead the cause of sects in his pulpit, as he would plead the cause of missions, or any other acknowledged christian interest? What ecclesiastical body would dare to take action of any sort, having for its object directly the encouragement and perpetuation of this system, as the glory of Protestantism and the promise of the millenium? The fashion, so far as outward talk and speech go, lies altogether the other way. All sects unite in deploring the misery of a divided christianity, and are ready on fit occasion to pass resolutions and make speeches in favor of unity, toleration, charity, and peace. All this means a great deal. It shows that the sect system is an abomination, and that the inmost voice of Christianity is against it, with all the pains that may be taken to disguise or forget the fact.

In a practical view, the mischievous working of the system, at this time particularly in our own country, is great beyond all that can be readily conceived or expressed. While its tyranny continues to be what it is now, we can have no vigorous theology, no sound and healthy piety, as the general privilege of the Church. On this subject however we do not care here particularly to enlarge.

We are glad then, in the case before us and in other cases, to see the tyranny of this system challenged and resisted. It is an evil that calls for rebellion. We confess moreover, that on the ground occupied by the sect system itself, we see not how it can make answer successfully to the protest of Mr. Stockton, Mr. Craig, or any other man who may be pleased to step forward in the same way as the champion of Bible Christianity; nor how it can pretend consistently to condemn them, or call them to account in any way, for the assertion of such evangelical freedom. For is it not a fixed principle with all sects, that the Bible is the only rule of faith and practice; and that the only sure and safe key for getting at the sense of this, is the mind of every

man left to study it for himself with the help of the Holy Ghost? Do they not all build professedly, from alpha to omega, on the same great Protestant watchword: "The open Bible and Private Judgment!" Is it not a settled maxim again with this system, that an old ecclesiastical communion may be forsaken, ought to be forsaken, and a new one formed, as often as the liberty of conscience, in the use of such private judgment, is found to require such change? Is it not the boast of the sect spirit, from time immemorial, to be the enemy thus of all church despotism, and the friend of the most unbounded spiritual independence? What plea then can it put in against the use of such liberty, to the full extent of a renunciation of *all* church authority, as we find it here exercised by Mr. Stockton and Mr. Craig? The Canandaigua Convention, denouncing the whole sect system as it now stands, and doing this on Bible principles, must be taken according to this theory to rest on just as good a foundation ecclesiastically, as any denominational convocation in the land. For what forms the ground of ecclesiastical right or power in any case? The Bible. And how is the Bible for this purpose, we ask again, to be interpreted and understood? By the ability simply that every man may have, with God's help, to get at its meaning. And why then should not the authority of the Canandaigua Convention be full as much to the purpose here, as that of any common sectarian organization. Or why should not the *exodus* of Mr. Stockton from the Methodist Protestant Church, and from the whole idea of church organization, be just as much entitled to respect, *on sect principles*, as the *exodus* of this M. P. Church itself from the Methodist Episcopal Church, or a little farther back still the *exodus* of the M. E. Church from the Episcopal Church of England? We see not, we say, how any effectual exception, in the sect world, can be taken to his course. The M. P. Church, it seems, is somewhat of the same mind; as he is allowed apparently to retire from its authority, and set up for himself, without any sort of ecclesiastical inquisition or account. So far, all right. The premises remain square with the conclusion. Mere toleration however in such a case, whether civil or ecclesiastical, is not enough. We may have that, and along with it only pity and contempt. To do full justice to the sect principle, as sects commonly make a boast of holding it, Mr. Stockton should not only be tolerated by the body he has left behind, as well as by other bodies, but cordially taken by the hand also all round, and welcomed into the circle of free and independent witnesses of the truth. Has he not made earnest with the great maxim, which

so many take to be the very palladium of Protestantism? Has he not cast himself fully on the Bible and Private Judgment, in opposition to all sorts of authority in every other form? Has he not made himself a martyr to the cause of Bible Christianity in this way, the rights of conscience, religious freedom, the authority of Christ in his own house over against all authority supposed to be false? And why then should he not be approved and applauded in his course? Why should we not rejoice to see others breaking away from all existing denominations in like style, and setting up every one for himself, in the name of the Bible, a truly *independent* standard? The more new sects and new positions after this fashion, it might seem, the better. And if it should come even to a complete disintegration of all religious communions, the full breaking up of the Church visibly considered, and a resolution of the christian faith and life into mere atoms or units, would it not deserve only to be hailed as the greatest possible triumph of the Bible and Private Judgment, the fullest possible allegiance of the christian world to the principle of freedom!

Such force undoubtedly this Bible Christianity has, over against the common posture of our religious sects. It is but a simple carrying out of their acknowledged principles to the end, towards which these run from the beginning. And yet it is a very easy thing, on the other hand, in the case of such an extreme, to show that it is full of contradiction and overthrows itself. It is indeed surprising, how a sensible man, like Mr. Stockton, should not see and feel this, in the mere exhibition, or at least with the shortest experiment, of his own favorite theory. The Bible has no life of its own, no voice, save as the truth it reveals is brought to live and speak in those who receive it as God's word. To be a creed or rule then, it must be reduced to some common understanding in the minds that embrace it, and agree to follow it, in such way. This may be written or it may be unwritten; but in the end it amounts to the same thing; it is a standard of belief and practice, in this respect a true church symbol and constitution, supposed of course to be taken from the Bible, but still as such out of the Bible and beside it. There can be absolutely no communion whatever, and no co-operation, on the basis of revealed truth, without some such common understanding and agreement, to at least a certain extent, in regard to what this truth teaches and requires. To give up one creed or confession then, so long as Christianity itself be not wholly abjured, is only to come under the authority of another. To pretend to give up all creeds, and to take simply the Bible in



their place, is an absurdity ; and if it mean anything at all, must signify the want of faith altogether ; since to have faith, is to believe some positive doctrine or fact, and this, though it may differ from all creeds besides, will then be to all intents and purposes itself a creed, as really as any of the systems it affects to reject. Mr. Stockton, of course, only deceives himself, and endeavors also innocently to deceive others, when he pretends to set Bible Christianity in opposition to all Denominationalism, and then claims to be himself the representative of the first to the full negation and exclusion of all that is comprehended in the idea of the second. Has *he* not also a theory of Christianity, a certain scheme of things in his mind, which he holds it necessary to preach and receive on the authority of the Bible? And what less is this, we ask, than the interposition of something, which is not of itself the written text and yet claims to be of force as authority, between the Bible and the minds of those to whom he preaches, or for whom he writes? He may please himself by styling it *true* authority, as opposed to authority that is false on the part of the different denominations. But by what measure, in this case, are truth and falsehood to be distinguished? Will he be so simple as to say: "I am but the echo of the Bible, and *therefore* worthy of confidence and faith ; while the several denominations evidently get their creeds from some other quarter." Does he not know, that each of these denominations claims to be the echo of the Bible as fully as himself, and has also full as much right to make this claim, and to be considered sincere in making it? By what principle or rule is it, that the Methodist scheme of Christianity, the Baptist scheme, the Presbyterian scheme, must be set down as the product of mere human thought and will forsaking the Bible, while the scheme of Thomas H. Stockton, singly and separately taken, is to be regarded as the true sense itself of the sacred volume? What better at best is such downright individualism, we may well inquire, than the mere denominationalism, under any form, from which it so graciously offers to set the world free?

"For years," says Mr. Stockton, "I have been trying to secure an honorable and useful position on the broad and lofty platform of Bible Christianity ; a position above all parties, civil, ecclesiastical, and social ; a position, in which—with real love for all persons, though in apparent opposition to many institutions—I might be allowed, by common consent and with common confidence, to speak out, in the hearing of all, and for the benefit of all, with unchecked but prudent liberty, either positively or negatively, for or against, according to my humble mea-

sure or ability, in all the relations of True and False authority. That, if there be any, seems to be the mission." For the accomplishment of this work, he thinks he has now found the right method. "A Teacher of Bible Christianity inquires: What does *Humanity*, just as we find it, *need*? He answers the question somewhat as follows: It needs the Bible—the Religion of the Bible, and the Social Institutions of the Bible; that is, it needs precisely what God has supplied. Next, he compares the Religion of the Bible with the Religion of the Age; and the Social Institutions of the Bible with the Social Institutions of the Age: and discovers great differences. Men have sadly perverted what God designed for their advantage." And so the business of such a teacher, having a mission to set the world right, is to meet the evil with which he finds himself surrounded on all sides, "in the family, in the school, in the store, in the society, in the church, in the state," with what he finds and sees to be the simple will of God as made known in the Bible.

The amount of all is simply this, that Mr. Stockton proposes to set his own views of what the Bible teaches and requires over against all other systems of belief, and claims in favor of the first the authority of absolute truth, while all besides is charged with at least partial error.

To be consistent, and true to his own principle, he is bound of course to extend the same right to all others. This, it would seem however, is more than he feels himself constrained to allow; as he evidently has a certain scheme of doctrine in his mind, which he takes to be the necessary proper sense of the Bible, and which he is ready to apply on all sides as a standard of evangelical orthodoxy. Here Mr. Craig shows himself more strictly in agreement with the general theory which both profess to hold. In his hands, we find the theory pushed out, without shrinking, to its most extreme consequences. The Bible must be allowed to rule the faith and practice of every man, in a perfectly free way; that is, without regulation or control of any sort whatever from the previous thinking of others, in the form either of confession or creed. He will allow no test or standard of orthodoxy. Enough simply, that men profess to receive and follow the Bible as God's word. We have no right to ask a single question in regard to what they find in it, or the use they make of it. The professor may be in sentiment a Trinitarian, Unitarian, or Arian, a Calvinist or Arminian, an Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, or Baptist; still it matters not; let him only waive all reference to these distinctions, planting himself before us on the broad platform of Bible Christianity, and it

becomes the duty of all christians, according to Mr. Craig, to extend to him the right hand of fellowship, and to encircle him with the arms of love.

This looks catholic and liberal. But it comes just to this in the end, that Christianity is emptied of all positive contents as a distinctive revelation, and reduced to the character of religion in its merely natural form. It is a catholicity which stands wholly in negations; by which all that is affirmed as a distinguishing interest by the different denominations is either denied, or at least treated as something of no worth, while all material truth is made to lie thus in a few abstractions, that are of so general and vague a character as to carry with them no living force whatever. Christianity in this form is of no definite shape. It is a mere name to represent all religious truth; some portion of which is taken to belong to almost every sect; while for this very reason, as representing all, the one faith of Christ must be held to be something different and distinct from every such particular manifestation. "*Simple Christianity* is the 'one faith' of Christ's Church. Lutheranism is not the faith of Christ's Church; because Lutheranism is something distinct from Christianity. So is Episcopalianism; so is Presbyterianism; so is Methodism. To embrace *simple Christianity* does not bring a man into the Methodist church; nor into the Catholic church; nor into the Reformed Dutch church: but it does bring him into the Christian church—the One Body of Christ." This is plainly to turn Christianity into nothing, to rob it of all positive character, to make it just what it may suit the private judgment and fancy of this man, that man, and every man, to raise to such distinction and clothe with such name. The absurdity stands forth clearly to view in the representation of Mr. Craig; it is in truth however fairly involved, to the same extent, in the more guarded and qualified views also of Mr. Stockton, and in the whole theory of Bible Christianity to which he is so much attached, and which he holds it his special mission to advocate and recommend. All such Christianity has a tendency to lose itself more and more in general abstractions, to substitute what is negative only for what is concretely real and positive, to become wide by becoming at the same time flat, and to shut out nothing finally just because there is nothing which it can be said effectually to comprehend and shut in.

With all our opposition to the sect system, then, we make no common cause whatever with the anti-sect spirit in this style. The cure for Denominational Christianity is not just what is here called Bible Christianity, the religion of Christ emptied of all positive contents and made to be what to every man may

seem best, taking the measure of it simply and wholly from himself.

This may strike some as a contradiction. The truth is, however, that the things which are thus opposed, carry in them after all no such real opposition as is frequently imagined. The antagonism between them is at best but relative and partial. At bottom, they are found to agree more than they differ. Both affect to make the Bible exclusively the foundation and source of Christianity. Both in this way deny the proper power of the living fact of Christianity itself objectively considered. Both show themselves thus completely unhistorical, and in spite of all their pretended reverence for revelation fall over to the rationalistic posture, by which this is brought into subordination always more or less to the mind and will of those who receive it, inasmuch as they are allowed to make themselves separately the measure of its universal sense. This Bible Christianity is only the Sect Christianity itself carried out to its last legitimate result, in which it is brought fairly to overthrow and destroy its own life. As compared with such extreme of individualism and subjectivity, the sect system has on its side a certain amount of right; and this right will be found to lie moreover in the direction precisely, where we are required to seek and acknowledge what is needed in order to master properly the difficult knot presented to us by the whole case. It looks to the idea of the *Church*, and in this way recognizes the necessity of history and tradition, the real authority of what Christianity has been and still is out of the Bible and beyond it; even while the system itself, in another view, stands at open war with all such objective christianity, and to a certain point asserts in opposition to it only the claims of private judgment and private will. No sect as such has hardihood enough to follow out its own principle to the end; for in that case it must give up its own denominational character, and lose along with it all positive substance. The true christian feeling comes in to withstand this; and sects are impelled accordingly, while they resist the true idea of the Church and fly from it, to turn round again, with vast practical inconsistency, and assert the attributes and prerogatives of this idea in their own favor. Each sect allows itself to be only a part of Christianity, a narrow insular interest and not the true wholeness of Christ's kingdom upon the earth; and yet in the next breath goes on to affirm rights and wield powers which can have no possible sense whatever, except as they are taken to be of truly universal force, and not merely of force for any one section or division only of the christian commonwealth. Every



sect, within its own limits, plays itself off as the Church; not merely as *a* church, one amongst many, as the language at times goes; but as *the* Church, which by its very conception is one and not many, universal and not partial, catholic and not denominational. All this is much the same sort of inconsistency and contradiction, which we meet in the old heathen notion of national or local deities, gods pretending to be possessed of divine attributes, whose force at the same time stopped short with the boundary of a mountain or river. Still the gross inconsistency of the thing is not regarded; and a whole score of sects sit beside each other, all putting on the airs of Jupiter in their separate spheres, and smiling towards each other graciously in token of their mutual toleration and forbearance. Each of them has its own tradition, its authority, its keys to open and to shut, its prophetic, priestly and kingly powers and pretensions, the whole moral paraphernalia indeed of the papacy itself, only not on the same wide sweeping scale and not in the same bold open way. All this is a contradiction; but it forms at the same time an important testimony to the truth of the Church, and is in fact a standing acknowledgment on the part of the sects, that their own starting point is false and untenable; that the Bible and private judgment are *not* the sole factors of Christianity; that it must have the basis of a real historical existence besides to rest upon, in order that it may carry with it any true and proper authority in the world. In this respect Sectarianism is a witness for important truth, in the first place against itself, and then of course still more decidedly against all mere Bible Christianity, (its own natural and proper end,) as we have it here represented by Mr. Stockton and Mr. Craig.

The truth to which witness is thus borne is the objective being of the Church, and so in this view the authority which belongs to the living historical revelation of Christianity in the world, along with the outward letter and word of it contained in the Bible. To make the Bible the bearer of all necessary truth for the individual mind, aside from the presence of the living fact of Christianity itself, is virtually to deny this fact, and to fall into the plausible net of rationalism. There is always a grand fallacy then involved in the imagination, that we get nearer to the truth in proportion as we make use of the Scriptures for the purpose in an exclusive and independent way. That is in fact to wrong the inspired volume itself. This takes for granted throughout the living spirit of Christianity as a real revelation in the world, by which only from age to age its proper force and meaning can become fully known. A purely Biblical Christianity

can never be a complete Christianity. It must be at the same time historical, the result of the real powers of the new creation working out in a whole way, from generation to generation, the solution of its own great problem.

J. W. N.

---

## THE BIRTH DAY OF THE CHURCH.

### §1. *The Miracle of Pentecost.*

Next to the Incarnation and Resurrection of the Son of God; the outpouring of the Holy Ghost and the birth of the Church constitutes the most important and influential fact recorded on the pages of history. As a miracle of the highest order which is daily repeated on a smaller scale in the regeneration and awakening of men, it entered the sphere of our human life attended and certified by phenomena of a supernatural character. Thousands who witnessed it on the day of Pentecost submitted to its conquering power. Over the entire surface of society it has scattered in rich profusion the seeds of life, and is destined, under the direction of Providence, to transform by the energy of the Spirit the whole human family into the image of Christ and unite it in close fellowship to God. For the subject now in hand must not be regarded as an isolated, transitory event whose impress has been worn away by the march of time, but as the generative germ of an infinite series of divine revelations in the course of history, as a fountain of life whose purifying waters flow with uninterrupted course through the channels of time into the bosom of a boundless eternity. The Holy Spirit who had hitherto enlightened, in a temporary and sporadic manner, a special class of men selected by Providence as the representatives of the Old Testament Dispensation, now appeared in the world as an integral, abiding member of its constitution, took up his residence in the hearts of a believing congregation, and has since manifested his power as the divine principle of light and life by means of which the redemption accomplished by Christ is to be made effectual in the conversion of men and the propagation of truth. Previous to his death our Lord expressly declared to his mourning disciples that the communication of the Spirit of Truth as an abiding blessing depended upon his going to the Father. "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if

I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you.”<sup>1</sup> In his farewell discourses delivered before his death as well as in his final valedictory prior to the Ascension (Acts 1: 8,) when He commanded them to tarry at Jerusalem till the promise should be fulfilled and they be baptised with the Spirit, He spake with special emphasis concerning the absolute necessity of his departure as the essential condition of the descent of the Comforter (v. 4, 5.).

That this remarkable occurrence which unquestionably constitutes one of the most prominent parts of history, might attract the attention of men of every clime and every tongue, God, in His infinite wisdom, had selected, for the time of its appearance, from the three great festivals of the Jews that which bore a like typical relation to the founding of the Church as the Passover to the death and resurrection of Christ. According to the common reckoning from the 16th of Nisan when harvest season began (Lev. 23: 11, Deut. 16: 9), Pentecost came on the fiftieth day<sup>2</sup> after the day immediately following Easter Sabbath (Lev. 23: 15, &c.), and was honored by the Jews with a double meaning. It was a festival of thanksgiving for the first fruits of the harvest which took place during the seven weeks preceding, and, on this account, is called in the Old Testament *the feast of weeks*<sup>3</sup> or *the feast of harvest*.<sup>4</sup> Besides, according to old Rabbinical tradition, it had at the same time reference to the establishment of the Theocracy by the giving of the Law at Sinai which happened about this season of the year (comp. Ex. 19: 1), and, on this account, was called the law-jubilee.<sup>5</sup> Both significations coincided exactly with the nature of the first Christian Pentecost when the types of the Old Testament economy were gloriously fulfilled. For then were gathered into the

<sup>1</sup> John 16: 7, comp. the remarkable passage John 7: 39.: For the Holy Ghost was not yet given (namely to the believers), because that Jesus was not yet glorified,” and John 12: 24, where Christ speaks with reference to his death: “Except a corn fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.”

<sup>2</sup> Hence the name, from the greek *hēmera pentekostē* or *pentekostē* merely as subst. (thus Tobiae 2: 1, 2 Macc. 12: 32.)

<sup>3</sup> “Hag Haschebuoth” (Deut. 16: 9, &c., Ex. 23: 16, Lev. 23: 15, &c.), *ἀγία ἐπερὰ ἐβδόμηδων* (Tobiae 2: 1.).

<sup>4</sup> “Hag Hakezir,” also “Jom Habecorim” (The Day of the first fruits, Numb. 28: 26).

<sup>5</sup> “Simchath Hathorah.” As regards this meaning of the festival the Old Testament and the writings of Philo and Josephus convey no certain information. It was inferred, however, from a comparison of Ex. 12: 2 and 19: 1.

garners of the Church, as the matured harvest of the Jewish nation, the first fruits of the Christian faith. Then was established the communion of the new covenant with privileges in no way restricted to a single nation or age, but gratuitously offered to all nations and ages by God who in the place of the letter of the law written on tables of stone which had power only to destroy the awakened sinner, implanted in the hearts of his followers the law of the spirit of life which works by love.

In the second chapter of the Acts we have a brief but comprehensive account of this significant event and the circumstances connected with it. In the year 30<sup>1</sup> of our era, on a Sabbath<sup>2</sup> day of the festival of Pentecost succeeding the resurrection of

<sup>1</sup> As regards the correctness of our era we agree with Bengel and Wieseler who admit that it commences four years too late. Comp. the "Chronolog. Synopsis of the four Gospels" by Wieseler, 1843, p. 48, &c. According to the statement of Luke (3: 23, comp. the corresponding chronological date in John 2: 20) Christ was about thirty years old when baptized; according to John he labored in his public ministry three years. He must have died, therefore, in the 34th year of his age.

<sup>2</sup> This view of the case must be adopted, because the 15th of Nisan, on which day according to the synoptic Gospels (with which also John, though apparently at variance with them, can and must be reconciled) Christ died, came on a Friday; consequently the 16th of Nisan of that year was a Sabbath Eve. If we reckon from this, according to the order given in Lev. 23: 15, fifty days, we cannot obtain a Sunday as the late Dr. Olshausen (in his commentary on Acts 2: 1) supposed who evidently started, in his calculation, with the same supposition, but again a Sunday Eve as Wieseler rightly judges (in his excellent "Chronology of the Apostolic Period" 1848, p. 19). In his chronological system all the results of which, however, we cannot adopt, this learned scholar attempts to ascertain still more precisely the festival of Pentecost and places it on the 6th of Sivan or the 27th of May, inasmuch as, according to his calculations, Christ died on the 8th day of April of the year 30. But, now, this view stands opposed to the primitive and universal practice of the Church which was accustomed to celebrate Pentecost on a Sabbath, on the fiftieth day after the Resurrection, and the tenth after the ascension of Christ. This difficulty, however, would easily be removed if we adopt the view of the Caraei, who affirmed, in opposition to the Pharisees, that the word שבת in the decisive passage Lev. 23: 11, 15, 16, must not be explained as referring to the first Easter day (the 15th Nisan) which was kept as a Sabbath no matter on what day it came, but to the *proper* Sabbath, that is, the seventh day of the week. In such case Pentecost would *always* come on a Sunday. This same view has been ably set forth by the acute Hitzig who urges its correctness, mainly, on lexicographic grounds (Easter and Pentecost. Letter to Ideler—Heidelberg, 1837). But it cannot be proven that the customs of the Caraei were prevalent in the time of Christ. On this account the safest method, perhaps, is to refer the celebration of Pentecost on a Sunday by the Church to an evangelical opposition to Judaism as the reason, which, in the end also, caused the celebration of the Passover to be changed from fixed days of the *month* to fixed days of the *week* and of the Sabbath to a Sunday.



Christ, the Apostles and other disciples of Jesus, in number about 120, (comp. Acts 1: 15,) were assembled with one accord in their house of prayer, or, as seems to us more probable, in a department of the temple.<sup>1</sup> During the first season for devotion (about 9 o'clock in the morning,) unusual phenomena announced the fulfillment of an event which had been promised with the most solemn assurance, expected with the most intense de-

<sup>1</sup> Similar difficulties are connected with the place of assembling. Luke designates the place by οἶκος, c. 2: 2, without any more precise determination of it. The majority of commentators, and amongst them Neander (Hist. of Apos. I p. 13, of the fourth Edition), admit that this expression in itself refers most naturally to a private house. If we adopt this meaning to the exclusion of others, we must suppose that the disciples, having been assembled in an upper chamber (ὑπερώου) which was used according to Oriental fashion for prayer, (comp. Acts 1: 13) stepped forth upon the flat roof, and thence addressed the people gathered in the forecourt; for in the house itself the immense multitude, of whom 3000 were baptized, could not possibly have been accommodated. But it is not absolutely necessary that οἶκος be referred to a private house. In 1 Kings 8: 10 (LXX) the word denotes the whole temple; with greater propriety may it be taken for ἱερόν when, as in the present case, a single department is spoken of. It is not even necessary to recur to the passages in Josephus' Antiq. VIII, 3, 2 where the thirty side-chambers which surrounded the main edifice, are called οἶκοι; for the temple itself included several buildings, οἶκοι, οἶκοδομαί, (comp. Mark 13: 1, 2, Math. 24: 1). That οἶκος in this present instance need not necessarily refer to a private house but to some department in the temple as both Olshausen and Wieseler conclude, will appear evident from the following considerations: 1. According to Luke 24: 53 and Acts 2: 46, (comp. Acts 5: 42) the disciples assembled daily in the temple. They still adhered to the worship practised by their fathers. These statements of Luke, apart from any positive declaration, authorize the conclusion that on the day of Pentecost the disciples were wont to assemble in the temple and on this one particularly they would not fail to be present. But he even signifies this much by the remark c. 2: 15 that the event happened about the third hour (9 o'clock in the morning) when the Jews presented their daily morning sacrifices in the temple. 2. This supposition gives to the entire occurrence a greater degree of credibility and renders it more easy of explanation. The gathering of the multitude in the temple, particularly, admits of a more natural interpretation. 3. Finally, we may say with Olshausen that the event itself gains in importance if it be admitted that "the solemn inauguration of the Church of Christ took place in the sanctuary of the old covenant." It might be objected, however, to this last remark that Christianity as an invocation of God in Spirit and in Truth attaches far less importance than either Judaism or Paganism, to the sacredness of particular times and places. The first two reasons, however, prove to us conclusively that the out-pouring of the Spirit was accomplished within the precincts of the temple. The mere mention of Pentecost c. 2: 1 would lead us to suppose this much; the entire connection would warrant a reference of οἶκος to a private house only in case the text necessarily compelled to such a meaning. But the expression οἶκος itself by no means includes such necessity.

sire, and prayed for with the most ardent supplication—the descent of the Spirit and the beginning of a new moral creation. It is a fact worthy not only of mention but of profound study that, in virtue of the mysterious sympathy existing between the physical and moral worlds, the grand leading epochs of history have generally been accompanied and authenticated, as it were, by extraordinary phenomena in the sphere of nature. Thus the proclamation of the Law delivered at Sinai was attended with thunder, and lightning, and the voice of a trumpet (comp. Ex. 19: 16, &c.). So in the case now under consideration, the disciples recognized in the visible form under which God revealed his presence to them an appropriate symbol of the spiritual act just accomplished. A sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, suddenly filled the quiet house of prayer. The Holy Ghost who once brooded over the chaos of the natural world as the life-giving breath of God, now appeared in a nobler character, under the form of cloven tongues like unto fire, as the spirit of the glorified Redeemer, as the spirit of faith and of love, of truth and of holiness. In this whole transaction, it is evident that the wind and fire were symbols expressive of the purifying, enlightening, and vivifying power of God. The believing disciples were translated into a new sphere of life, into the very centre of the christian system, and, in conformity to the prediction of Christ, became instruments by means of which the Holy Spirit announced His presence and intentions: “The Spirit of truth shall testify of me and ye also shall bear witness” (John 15: 26, 27). For the bearing of witness is the first fruit of faith and furnishes at the same time resources for its propagation. Forthwith they gave vent to their feelings in audible prayers and songs of praise; with joy ineffable and a courage which neither difficulties nor threats could daunt, they proclaimed the wondrous workings of God and the redemption effected by Christ to the astonished people who, attracted by the rushing noise and the speaking in tongues,<sup>1</sup> had flocked around them. During this period when their minds were enkindled by the exciting feelings of an unusually exalted inspiration, the language of common life failed to express the new spiritual ideas which agi-

<sup>1</sup> The *φωνῆς τάντης* Acts 2: 6 seems to be referred by the *demonstr.* to the speaking in tongues immediately preceding, whilst the singular of the subst. seems to refer it to the rushing wind (v. 2). But as in the distance persons could not distinguish the single voices but would hear an indistinct general noise, the phrase may be regarded as an undefined collective and applicable to both.

tated their souls. As body and soul, thought and language, are necessary complements to each other and cannot come to true expression without mutual adaptation, it was necessary that the Spirit thus poured out should originate in them words fit for the transmission of the new thoughts infused into their minds. Here, accordingly, for the first time, came to view the power of *speaking in tongues* which Christ prior to his ascension had expressly promised would be given to his disciples (Mark 16: 17). The obscurity connected with the right understanding of this remarkable phenomenon compels us to enter upon an investigation of its character. It must be confessed, however, that, on account of a want of experience in events of a like nature and, consequently, of the almost inextricable confusion in the interpretation of the passages<sup>1</sup> bearing upon the subject, it does not admit of a perfectly satisfactory and clear representation.

## §2. *The Speaking in Tongues.*

The power of speaking with *other* or *new Tongues* (Glossology<sup>2</sup>) is one of the most extraordinary spiritual gifts which distinguish the apostolic church from all other periods of history whose character bears the lineaments of more tranquil and natural features. Down to the second and third centuries we find traces of its presence.<sup>3</sup> If we leave out of view the sporadic and oc-

<sup>1</sup>The different interpretations of γλώσσαις λαλεῖν which we cannot here state in detail, have been classified in the most convenient and complete form by De Wette in his commentary on the Acts p. 20-30.

<sup>2</sup>Luke, in his account of the festival of Pentecost, makes use of the expression "to speak with *other* tongues" (ἐτέραις γλώσσαις λαλεῖν), which may stand opposed to the vernacular and, in some sense, to all human languages. Our Lord himself designates the gift (Mark 16: 7) as "a speaking with *new* (καινῆς) tongues" which seems to imply that a language hitherto unknown and the direct product of the Spirit, would be spoken by the disciples. With these exceptions we always find in use the abbreviated formula: "to speak with tongues" (γλώσσαις λαλεῖν, also in the singular γλώσση λαλεῖν, Acts 10: 46; 19: 6; 1 Cor. c. 12 and 14.). The simplest grammatical meaning of γλώσση is: *dialect*. This is demanded by the qualifying adjective ἐτέραις in the second chapter of the Acts and the word "*dialect*" which the strangers then present (v. 8) evidently used in the same sense. Besides, it alone agrees with the singular form γλώσση λαλ. as used by Paul. This last formula is sufficient to disprove the interpretation of Bleek who explains γλώσσαις as referring to uncommon, highly poetical, and provincial expressions—a meaning which profane writers very seldom allow and cannot be admitted in the Old and New Testament.

<sup>3</sup>Irenaeus (died 202) speaks of many brethren living in his own time who "were in possession of prophetic powers and spake by the aid of the

casional appearances of modern times concerning which it may with propriety be asked whether they proceed from the operation of the Holy Spirit, or of an unusually excited nature that delights to revel in exhibitions of a sickly, sentimental fanaticism of feeling,<sup>1</sup> we may safely affirm that since the third century the gift of speaking with other tongues has utterly vanished.

In considering this subject we must take care to ascertain what constitutes the *peculiar* nature of glossology as a gift of the apostolical Church in general and the particular form it assumed at its first appearance on the day of Pentecost. In order to

Spirit in various languages (*παντοδαπαῖς γλώσσαις*) and exposed to view the hidden things of men and the mysteries of God for the spiritual improvement of Christians" (adv. baer. V, 6.) Comp. the somewhat obscure passage of Tertullian in his argument against Marcion V, 8 and Neander's History of the Planting &c., I, 26, 4, Edition.

<sup>1</sup> We refer to the speaking with tongues as exercised in the assemblies of the Irvingites. A Swiss, by name Michael Hohl, who was an eye and ear witness of their proceedings, gives the following interesting description in his "fragments of the life and writings of Edward Irving, former preacher of the Scottish National Church in London," St. Gallen, 1839, p. 149: Previous to their speaking one could observe that the persons concerned were wholly absorbed in self-contemplation which manifested itself in closing the eyes and covering them with the hand. Suddenly, as if struck by an electric flash, they fell into spasmodic convulsions which shook the whole body; then gushed forth from quivering lips a copious, passionate effusion of strange, energetic tones, resembling most nearly, in my opinion, the sounds of the Hebrew language, which were usually repeated three times and, as already said, with incredible vehemence and acuteness. After this first outburst of strange sounds which were regarded as the main proof for the genuineness of the inspiration, followed invariably, in no less violent tone, a shorter or longer address in English which was likewise repeated partly by words and partly by sentences and consisted now in very forcible and earnest admonitions, then in horrible warnings of approaching misery, and in words full of soothing comfort and moving pathos; the last part was generally regarded as a periphrastic explanation of the first, although it as such could not be wholly explained by the speaker himself. Having given utterance to his feelings the inspired person continued for some time in a state of profound silence and recovered only by degrees from the weakness occasioned by his powerful excitement." The inward condition of such persons was told the narrator by a young girl after the following fashion: "Suddenly and unexpectedly the Spirit seized hold on her with irresistible power. For the time she felt herself to be entirely under the influence of a higher nature and guided by its motions, without which, indeed, she would have been incapable of such severe physical exertion. Of that which she was compelled to speak she had no distinct consciousness; much less did she understand anything of what she spake in a strange, and to her utterly unknown, language, so that she was not able to give any precise account of the scene in which she had been the chief actor. A state of great weakness and exhaustion succeeded the departure of the inspiration, from which she in a short time recovered."



a proper understanding of the first point we must summon to our aid the remarks made by Paul in his first epistle to the Corinthians.—As regards its general *nature* it may be termed an involuntary, spiritual speaking in an ecstatic state of the most exalted devotion, in which the subject is not translated to a sphere beyond himself but buried rather in the inmost essence of his own being and brought into felt contact with that part of his nature which allies him directly to the Divine mind. In such case the ordinary consciousness of himself and the surrounding world recedes, disappears, as it were, and the language of common life fails to give utterance to his feelings, while his consciousness of God's presence governs his whole personality and he becomes the involuntary organ of the divine Spirit that dwells within him. Hence it is written in Acts 2: 4; "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." This inspiration has respect to form and contents, to thought and language. Paul calls the speaking with tongues a praying and singing "in the spirit" (*πνευμα*); by means of which he distinguishes the highest intuitional faculty, or the direct consciousness of God from "the understanding" (*νοῦς*), or the logical, reflective consciousness (1 Cor. 14: 14, 15). The contents of the speaking with tongues was a praising of the wonderful works of the redeeming love of God (Acts 2: 11; 10: 46; 1 Cor. 14: 14, 16,) in the form of prayer, thanksgiving, and song (Acts 10: 46; 1 Cor. 14: 14, 18). Closely related to it is the gift of prophesying which likewise sprang from a direct inward revelation of divine mysteries and in Acts 19: 6 is mentioned in immediate connection with the gift bestowed on the day of Pentecost. The difference between them is of a twofold character. In the first place, the man who employed other tongues addressed himself directly to God, while the prophet spake to the congregation; in the second place, the latter delivered his thoughts in such form that even unbelievers could understand their meaning, while the former, such was the case at least in the Corinthian Church, could not be understood without the aid of an interpreter (1 Cor. 14: 2, &c). Hence Paul gives the preference to the gift of prophesying (1 Cor. 14: 5) and likens the speaking with tongues to sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal (1 Cor. 13: 1), to the uncertain sound of an instrument (1 Cor. 14: 7, 8), of a barbarous language which no man can understand (1 Cor. 14: 11) and which appears to the uninitiated as proof positive of madness in those who exercise it (v. 23). The speaking in tongues, therefore, was a dialogue carried on be-

tween the enraptured soul and God, an act of the most intense devotion which could become a source of profit to others only by being interpreted and translated into the language of common life. As regards this last point, however, an important difference obtained between the gift of tongues as described by the Apostle and the gift of tongues as used on the day of Pentecost. This leads us to a consideration of the second point of our subject.

As regards the *particular form* which this gift first assumed, it seems to have been immediately intelligible to the hearers without any explanation; at least, in the account recorded in the Acts no mention is made of an interpreter. Even in such case, however, there must have been at hand an inward receptivity for the proper apprehension of the truth delivered; for a portion of the assembled multitude turned the entire occurrence into a convenient occasion for mockery and regarded it as the product of minds disordered by intoxication (Acts 2: 13). But there was a second and more important difference. Paul gives no sufficient reason to suppose that the speaking with tongues consisted in the use of various foreign languages as distinguished from the vernacular. He himself, though pre-eminently endowed with the gift of tongues (1 Cor. 14: 18: "I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than ye all"), did not understand the speech of Lycaonia (Acts 14: 11, 14). The ecclesiastical tradition of primitive antiquity, also, speaks of interpreters of the Apostles; thus Papias calls Mark "the Interpreter of Peter." It would seem necessary, therefore, to suppose the existence of an unusual facility in the use of the vernacular, or of an entirely new spiritual language which differed from all *other* languages in vogue in the same degree that the thoughts and feeling of the speaker were elevated above the consciousness and understanding of common life. The internal ecstasy that agitated the subject, and the unusual spiritual elevation of the soul which was involuntarily brought into close connection with the Divine life, manifested their presence in this particular *mode* of communication. Yet this mode of speech itself, it must be borne in mind, so far as its essential nature is concerned, did not annihilate the language originally spoken by the subject but stood rather in close fellowship with it. Those, accordingly, who were not under the influence of this high-wrought inspiration, could not possibly understand the speaker who felt its power. The Acts of the Apostles, on the contrary, evidently describe the gift of tongues as a speaking in the strange languages of the foreigners who were present on the day of Pentecost. For, from this very

cause, their great astonishment sprang that illiterate Galileans should speak in languages they had never acquired by natural means and the knowledge of which must have been suddenly bestowed upon them by supernatural agency (Acts 2: 6, 11). Even commentators of the rationalistic school cannot deny that the account plainly delivers such a meaning. If, then, we refuse to recognise any difference between the gift of tongues on the day of Pentecost and that bestowed on the church of Corinth, and to adopt the supposition that the disciples spake strange languages which they could not possibly have acquired by actual study; we will be compelled either to acknowledge an unhistorical, mythical element in the account of Luke<sup>1</sup>—and this both internal and external reasons forbid—or a self-deception on the part of the hearers whose impressions the narrator has impartially recorded without passing his private judgment on their credibility. As regards this latter view, we might either suppose that the disciples, having been filled with divine energy, spake in an entirely new language originated by the Holy Spirit, though more closely allied, perhaps, to the Aramaic than to any other, language, with such intense enthusiasm and inspiring force that the susceptible hearers involuntarily translated what they heard into their respective vernacular tongues, just as though it had originally been delivered in them, and that the barriers which sundered the different languages of the earth were momentarily removed by a participation in the communion of the Holy Spirit. Or, according to another supposition, we may suppose that the Apostles spake the *primitive language* which the arrogance of those who essayed to climb the heavens by building the tower of Babel had caused to be divided into a multitude of single distinct tongues. In gracious condescension to the humility manifested by the members of the renewed Zion, God had given them power to gather its scattered fragments and relicts and restore its primeval unity. On this memorable Pentecostal day its enlivening tones sank deep into the inmost recesses of the hearts of the hearers; reminding them of the happi-

<sup>1</sup>As Neander does, Hist. Apost. I, p. 28. This is one of the instances in his history of the Apostles—and more may be found in his Life of Christ—in which this venerable theologian whose profound experience of the living power of Christianity otherwise separates him at an almost infinite distance, we might say, from the dangerous tenets of Rationalism, has yielded too much force to the results of Modern Criticism.

ness enjoyed in the Paradasaical period and encouraging them with cheering hopes for the future.<sup>1</sup>

It must be confessed, however, that these attempts at a psychological explanation of the miracle of tongues do not afford entire satisfaction. We feel disposed to place implicit confidence in the verbal meaning immediately derived from the record contained in the Acts, and give it as our opinion that, at the first manifestation of this gift and in presence of an immense multitude congregated from all parts of the habitable globe, the Holy Spirit in order to stamp the deepest possible impression on the minds of those whose dispositions were susceptible of it,<sup>2</sup> elevated the minds of the disciples to an unusual pitch of spiritual excitement and discernment and gave them power, temporarily, to understand and to use with facility the different languages of the several nations then represented. Nor is it a difficult task to ascertain the symbolical meaning of this astounding event. It was a practical demonstration of the universalness of the Christian system which embraces within its compass all nations and countries, and of the fact that in no long time the tidings of salvation would be proclaimed in every language spoken on earth. Now, that the Church and the Bible promulgate the glorious deeds of Jehovah in every clime and every tongue, the single Christian has no necessity for the gift of tongues for a right understanding of the truth. Already in the Apostolical period did the power of speaking with other tongues, though in substance the same, lose its original form. For it is not possible to understand the reason why this gift as employed in the house of Cornelius (Acts 10 : 46 ; comp. 19 : 6) or in the church of Corinth, should have been exercised in the use of foreign languages. In the Roman empire where Christianity achieved its

<sup>1</sup> Adopting this or a similar explanation we may say with the venerable Bede: *Unitatem linguarum, quam superbia Babylonis disperserat, humilitas ecclesiae recolligit*, or with Grotius: *Poenā linguarum dispersit homines ; donum linguarum dispersos in unum populum recolligit*. It would seem then as if in the first beginning of the Church the end of her progress had been prophetically anticipated, when there shall be not only one Shepherd and one fold but one language also of the Holy Spirit.

<sup>2</sup> If we could place any reliance on the speaking with tongues of the Irvingites as a reasonable analogy, we would have a similar elevation in their case, because according to the above cited report of Hohl the ecstatic speeches were first delivered in foreign sounds like unto the Hebrew, and, when the inspiration had abated somewhat of its vigor, in the vernacular English.



principal victories, the preachers of the Gospel could make their thoughts almost universally intelligible by means of the Greek and Latin languages, and the style of Paul's expression in Greek proves that he had acquired a knowledge of it by natural means. Nor do the old missionary reports afford any proof that the rapid spread of the Gospel was brought to pass, or, in any way, assisted by the supernatural gift of tongues.

At any rate this much is certain, that the Bible considers the rise of several distinct languages as a penalty inflicted on man for perverseness of nature (Gen. 11), and that Christianity can not only accommodate itself to all languages and nations but has power also to remove all the barriers which sin has erected to obstruct the progress of Society, to gather into one fold the scattered sheep of God's selection, and to unite them in the bonds of a single language—the language of the Spirit.

### §3. *The Sermon of Peter and its Result.*

The astonishment of the susceptible hearers who were overpowered by such wonderful phenomena and the disdainful reproach of unbelievers who attributed the speaking with other tongues to the influence of intoxicating drinks, compelled the Apostles to speak in vindication of their character and of the event itself. The argument they pronounced in favor of the truth, constituting as it did their first independent testimony, was spoken from a firm conviction that the fulness of the Spirit dwelt within them, and proved to be the efficient signal for the ingathering of the first fruits of the new spiritual creation. In immediate connection thus with the founding of the Church was established the office of preaching which henceforth constituted the chief agent for the propagation of the kingdom of God. The witness of the Holy Spirit confirmed its power in those who were His representatives. In conformity to the character portrayed of him in the Gospel the impetuous, rash Peter whose constitutional disposition admirably qualified him for a leader and spokesman, stood forth in the name of the rest of the Apostles and of the entire Church and gave practical demonstration of the truth that he was the rock on whose courageous confession of the faith the Lord had promised to build His Church. His speech to the assembled multitude, delivered most probably in the Hebrew language, is uncommonly simple and in beautiful harmony with the significance of the day. It was neither a direct polemical assault upon Judaism, nor a systematic exhibition of doctrine,

but a simple proclamation of historical facts, particularly of the resurrection of Christ; it was a plain but powerful testimony of the most assured experience that issued directly from the spiritual life of the speaker. Worthy of special note because of its remarkableness, is the contrast between the exalted inspiration of the speaking with tongues that preceded and the considerate discretion and sparkling clearness of this sermon. But it is the harmonious union of both that constitutes a characteristic trait in the lives of the Apostles who were alike removed from a cold, calculating formality and an extravagant, sentimental fanaticism. With humble affability and a mildness worthy of imitation Peter first refutes the unkind charge of drunkenness with the very modest and apparently trivial, but popular and convincing argument, that it was but the third hour of the day (9 o'clock in the morning), before which time the Jews took good care to abstain from every indulgence and even drunkards were ashamed to give way to the vice of intemperance. This phenomenon, he goes on to remark, is rather to be regarded as the glorious fulfillment of the prophecy of Joel who predicted that the outpouring of the Spirit would be attended with remarkable natural appearances and would not be confined to single ambassadors of God of pre-eminent piety and talent, as was the case under the reign of the old covenant, but extended to all, the rich and the poor, the learned and the unlearned. This communication of the Spirit has been effected by Jesus of Nazareth, the promised Messiah, who as such has been powerfully authenticated, in your presence and for your good, by deeds and miracles. You have, it is true, in obedience to the eternal design and foreknowledge of God,<sup>1</sup> delivered him up and caused him to be nailed to the cross by the hands of idolatrous Romans;

<sup>1</sup> On the part of God the death of Christ was the fulfillment of His eternal decree for the salvation of men, of Christ, a voluntary act of love, of the Jews, a crime for which they could justly be held responsible, the climax of their sins against Jehovah. In this instance only the first and the last reference come into view. Peter charges upon *all* present the murder of Jesus, because the act of the government is the act of the people represented by it, who besides were directly implicated, for they cried out: "Crucify, crucify him!" and because the death of Christ on account of the general depravity of man is an act caused and guilt incurred by the entire human family. When Meyer in his commentary on Acts 2: 23, objects to the validity of this last reason that, if correct, Peter, including himself of course, would have spoken in the *first* instead of the second, person, he overlooks the fact that the Apostle here speaks in the name of God and of Christ and that he as a *believer* had been pronounced free from all participation in that guilt.

but God has raised him up again from the dead, in fulfillment of the prophecy contained in the sixteenth psalm,<sup>1</sup> of which we all are living witnesses. Elevated to the right hand of God the risen Saviour has poured out upon us his disciples His Spirit, as you yourselves see. Let it be known, therefore, unto you that God himself has demonstrated with irrefragible evidence Him to be the Messiah whom you have crucified and from whom you as Israelites expect salvation. It was evidently of prime importance to prove, in few but convincing words, from present facts in connection with the plain predictions of the Old Testament which the hearers themselves recognized, that Jesus was the promised Messiah, and, at the same time, by referring to the crucifixion which the Jews had virtually accomplished, to stir them up to an exercise of true, hearty repentance. The sermon of the Apostle did not fall short of its intended effect. Earnestly coveting the blessing of salvation the convicted hearers asked: "What shall we do?" Peter called upon them to repent of sin and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, that they too might obtain the same Holy Spirit whose miraculous power they saw so strikingly exemplified in the case of the Apostles. For the promise had been designed for them and their children and even for those Gentiles<sup>2</sup> whom the Lord

<sup>1</sup> David composed this Psalm with a conscious knowledge of the Theocracy which God had promised should enjoy an imperishable existence, and looked forward with the eye of prophecy to the Messiah who would vanquish the power of the grave and of death and bring to pass the ideal Theocracy. Olshausen thus explains the subject: "The dread of annihilation and of the dark valley of death excited in David an earnest longing after complete victory over death, and this triumph the Spirit of prophecy allowed him to see achieved in the person of Christ." Hengstenberg, in his commentary on the Psalms vol. 1. p. 301 ff., follows the opinion of Calvin and regards the pious singer as the immediate subject of the sixteenth Psalm; but as David v. 10, triumphs over death and the grave in the consciousness of his union with God, the Psalm must have reference to the Messiah, because he could enjoy this satisfaction only as a member of the body of Christ. "Sundered from Christ" says Hengstenberg, p. 337, "this hope must be regarded as fanatical the futility of which results will render abundantly evident. David served God in his day and generation, then died, was buried, and returned to dust. In Christ, however, who brought life and immortality to light, this hope has its real truth. David in Christ had a perfect right to speak as he does in this Psalm. Christ overcame death not only for himself but for his members also. His resurrection is our resurrection."

<sup>2</sup> Thus we understand the *τοῖς ἐς μακρὰν* Acts 2: 39, comp. Zachar 6: 25. Peter knew then that the Gentiles were called to take part in the Gospel, but supposed that they must first become Jews till the vision (c. 10) enlarged his view and rectified his error.

would call to participate in His Kingdom. Here as on every page of the Scriptures, repentance and faith, abandonment of the world and of sin and return to God through Christ, are insisted upon as the fundamental conditions of a participation in the Kingdom of heaven and the blessings of salvation, namely the forgiveness of sins, imparted and guaranteed by Christian baptism and the gift of the Holy Ghost as the principle of a new divine life. After several admonitions to repentance the susceptible hearers who cheerfully accepted the word preached, submitted to baptism, and about 3000 souls were gathered into the garner of the Christian Church during this first harvest season of the new covenant. The life-inspiring testimony of Peter and the extraordinary operation of the Holy Ghost supplied the want of a longer preparatory discipline for the solemn act of baptism which in this instance happened contemporaneously with a change of heart. But the young plant stood in need of much nourishment and assiduous care. The believers engaged with one accord in cultivating the four main elements of every genuine Christian church-life; they gave faithful attention to the instruction of the Apostles, continued in brotherly communion the bond of which was an ever-active self-sacrificing love, in the breaking of bread, that is, in the use of the Lord's Supper in connection with their daily love-feasts, and in prayer (Acts 2 : 24). "And the Lord added daily to the Church such as should be saved."

Such was the normal beginning of the Church, the like of which has not since been, but will be when the prophecy of Joel shall receive its last absolute fulfillment. This young band of believers with their successors now became the salt of the earth to preserve from spiritual putrefaction the mass of mankind. It was ordained that, henceforth, from the society established on this day should proceed every real advance in morality, science, art, social prosperity and outward civilization, as well as all the important epochs of Modern History. The Apostles previously timid, now gloried in their strength and bore witness to the truth with indomitable courage. Previously unknown and illy appreciated, they now became the heroes of the age who soon attracted the attention of the whole world outside of Palestine. A few honest, poor fishermen of Galilee called upon to bear witness of the Holy Spirit and transformed from illiterate, unpolished men to infallible ambassadors of the Saviour of the world and teachers of all succeeding ages; truly, this is a miracle in our eyes!



## PUBLIC WORSHIP.

Continued.<sup>1</sup>

Having made known the design of his Collection, and ascertained the character of the worship which obtained in the Reformed Church, Prof. Ebrard proceeds to enquire concerning the principles of Evangelical worship, in general. This is the most interesting chapter in his work. To appreciate it fully, we must remember that the Reformed Church originally was made up of several provincial churches, the principal of which was the Zuinglian, the Calvinistic, and the Melancthonian; from which last branch the church of the Palatinate, the Ger. Ref. Church of America is chiefly derived. It is also to this branch that we are indebted for the Heidelberg Catechism, This venerable symbol of our faith was prepared in 1563, by Ursinus and Olivianus, the one a pupil and devoted friend of the amiable Melancthon; the other an equally attached follower of Calvin, at the commence of the Elector, Fred, III, of blessed memory, as he is styled in the preface to one of our earliest liturgies. The leading object of this excellent prince, in having this work prepared was to allay the strifes, and harmonize the views of his people in religious subjects; and by committing it to the hands of two individuals, distinguished for their learning and piety, and occupying prominent positions as the representatives of the two confessions into which the protestant church was divided, he hoped to succeed. This is a highly significant historical fact, illustrative of the theological character of this venerable symbol, and should rule in our interpretation of its doctrines, and in all our investigations and labors with a view to a Liturgy for the Ger. Ref. Church. What then, is its theological character? It certainly can be expected to contain no view upon any question—the Sacramental for instance—lower than Calvin would have expressed; nor any on the other hand, higher than Melancthon entertained. It must, accordingly, occupy immediate ground, as these good and wise men could not have subscribed it: nor would it have answered the end proposed in preparing it. This too is the proper platform of the Ger. Ref. Church.

It will doubtless be a relief to the minds of many to discover,

<sup>1</sup>In the Article, as it appeared in the May No. of the Review, are mistakes of the printer, "too tedious to mention." The reader will please correct the following, as interfering with the sense and construction of the passages in which they occur. In the first, and also in the third sentences of the translation on page 297, for "as" read *or*. In the next to the last sentence of the paragraph on page 297, for "term," read *time*. Near the bottom of page 304 for "church" singing, read *choral* singing. In the second paragraph on page 300, a period occurs in the middle of a sentence.

that of all the Reformers, none, according to Ebrard, himself a Zurich, was more liturgical or conservative than Zuingli. He was no radical. It will also be pleasant to observe with what candour and amiability of feeling, as well as earnestness of spirit, our learned German divines discuss theological questions of the greatest moment. Their object is truth.

### *The Principles of Evangelical Worship.*

THE UNIVERSAL, VISIBLE CHRISTIAN CHURCH is a *teleological Institution*. She is not, as some would define her, *l'homme spirituel collectif*; for then she would be the kingdom of God, and all unregenerate persons, and to carry out the idea, all who are sinners, would be excluded. Nothing would then remain, but that either we must altogether deny the existence of a *visible* universal Church, and merely admit, in addition to the visible particular Churches, an invisible universal Church, which would be *contradictio in adjecto*;<sup>1</sup> or we must insist upon a donatistic purity of the church. The church, more correctly, is the multitude of those, who have been baptized into the name of the Triune God, and includes no one who is not capable of redemption,—nor any one, who does not still *need* it. Accordingly, a person may with full right be a member of the Church of Christ at large upon earth, without being a member of the kingdom of God, the “invisible church;” if in a general way we would call it church.

THE OBJECT OF THE CHURCH is to enable its members to become members also of the kingdom of God. In order to this, they must be born again, and become members of the body of Christ. In this work, the Holy Spirit, and the will of man, must be co-operating factors. The *basis*, however, upon which alone this activity is possible, the *conditio sine qua non*, is an *acquaintance with the Lord Jesus, as an historical person*, inasmuch as redemption is not an idea, but a fact—an historical transaction—the manifestation of the *divine* counsel in an *historical* act.

To present this basis, this possibility to her members is the proper object of the church. It is not in her power to produce

<sup>1</sup> When the Reformers speak of the universal, catholic church as invisible, they mean to express their opposition only to that sort of visibility contended for by the Papists, i. e. the necessity of a visible, supreme Bishop. That the attribute of visibility, in other respects, belongs to the universal Church, has been satisfactorily shown by Calvin & Schleirmacher.

faith magically ; neither can she, nor ought she to force any one to believe. She only proposes the word of Christ, and the sacraments to every ones acceptance, and leaves it to them, to make such use of them, as they will.

She attains this object, partly, by working in an *outward* way upon such as ought to be, but, as yet, are not members, by means of missions, and Catechetical instructions ; and partly by working *inwardly*, upon those who are members ; and so far as this last activity has reference to the whole congregation, and not only to individuals in their private concern for the salvation of their souls, it is called WORSHIP.

From what has thus far been said, it will be seen that the Church has two sides, an *ideal* and a *real*. She stands forth as an ideal power *over* her existing individual members, and is related to them pedagogically. As ideal, she is possessed of saving truth, and expresses and declares what she *has*. The same Church is at the same time, however, a real existence, consisting of the same members, who are to be converted, redeemed, and sanctified. It follows, then, that each of these forces, at least as *mininum* must be present in each of her members. No one belonging to the Church, can be exclusively receptive. Every one must be qualified also, to some extent, to represent the ideal side over against others, and to exert a reflex influence upon them, even if it is only by means of a general participation in the worship,—the devotional exercises of the congregation ; and in this way the *general priesthood* of the members of the Church is maintained. Nor can any member of the Church be purely and exclusively active, so as only to represent the ideal power, the *strength* of the Church, and be wholly separate from the condition of those, who *need* salvation. The church functionary, the Minister, is only one of the congregation, himself a sinner, who needs forgiveness and sanctification ; and *thus of iiself excludes a peculiar priesthood*. For the sake of order, and by the appointment of Christ, there is the office of the ministry of the Word, but not a priesthood. It is the Roman Church, which externally separates the ideal, from the real Church, and the Clergy from the Laity, and that gives to the first, all the honors of the Church, regarding it only as ideal, and as a second mediator between the Sinner and Christ. It is *Sectism*, that regards the Church as only real, and not as existing continually, but produces it new, every moment. In Popery, faith proceeds from the Church, and not the Church from faith. In Sectism, it is the reverse ; the Church proceeds from faith, and not faith from the Church. The Evangelical Church holds

fast to both views. The Church, as *ideal*, is before and independent of faith, and leads her members to faith; but in her *reality* she renews, and sustains herself continually through the faith of her members.

So much then, must be said of WORSHIP. True evangelical worship must not be simply an exposition of the doctrines which the Church, as ideal, possesses, whether it be an exposition in words or symbols. The Sermon, particularly, as the central point of worship, must not be merely expository, not simply an expression of the religious belief, or consciousness of the ideal Church; much less of course, a mere expression of the consciousness of the existing individual, real congregation with all its imperfections. But the worship must be essentially *teleological*, effective, working towards a particular object. The object of the ideal universal church, to instruct her existing members, to lead them to Christ, to enable, and make it easy for them to believe, must also be at the foundation of Worship. The Worship and the sermon especially, must be one act, one work, one effort towards improvement.

It must now be perfectly evident that in this way the *expository* side of worship is not excluded, but on the contrary, retained. If the real Church, as she exists in the concrete congregation of any particular period, is to be carried forward upon the way of salvation, and brought to Christ, there must be a leading, directing, assisting, propelling power, and that not out of the Church, but within her. It is the one, and the same church, that is *to be lead*, and that *must lead*. She must have, in addition to a sense of the *need* of spiritual progress, a self-propelling, or advancing power. In other words, that, which the Church should attain to as a concrete reality, *must already exist within her*, as an ideal power. And, thus the teleological work itself is an *exhibition, at the same time, of that which is already present in ideality*.

In WORSHIP, the concrete members of the Church, *which need* salvation, will be assisted on the way of salvation, by this, that the church, *which is ideal*—not only through her particular functionaries, the Ministers, but through all her members, so far as in addition to their *need*, there is also present in them a *power*—suffers such stores of saving truth to be exhibited, as she has in possession.

Thus the Sermon is of service in this, that by means of it, the Minister expresses the faith of the one, ideal, Church, eternal, revealed truth. So also is the Liturgy of service in the same way, since in it the congregation expresses the faith of the one ideal Church.



This leads us now to the SUBJECTS OF THE LITURGY. In the first place, two subjects here present themselves to our notice, the Minister, as *preacher*, to make known the word of Christ, and the Congregation to receive it; and who, that they may receive it, *pray* to God for the grace of his Holy Spirit. To the prayer we can attach no exclusive significance. We can ascribe to it no other, than that which it has in its reference to the sermon; not to the sermon indeed, as the subjective individual words of the preacher, but as it proclaims the salvation which is in Christ. The prayer accordingly *must* have reference to the *preaching of salvation in Christ*, as the central point of divine worship. To place the sermon, and the liturgical prayer aside of each other as two distinct parts of worship, without mutual relation—as is the case in the Anglican Liturgy—would be consistent only in case we were to deny, in reference to either, that the salvation in Christ must be its inmost core. We could then, either make the Liturgical part of divine service have respect to the central point of redemption, and allow it to be sufficient for the sermon, if it only moved somewhere about the periphery; or we might insist that the sermon, in the exposition of every text, should conduct to Christ, and be satisfied, if the Liturgy furnished occasional intercessions for individual cases. Both these views are defective, and so soon as we see this, and are assured that Christ is the very heart, and core of both the sermon, and the prayers, we will be disposed to place them both in the most intimate reciprocal relation.

It follows from this, however, that a *Liturgist* in addition to the Preacher, and the Congregation, as a third subject of the Liturgy, cannot well be admitted. On the contrary, when the Congregation, together chant one part of the prayer and repeat another part, word for word, after the officiating Minister, it is only a formal difference, grounded in the fact, that standing forms are better adapted to be spoken, and prayers of special contents, to be sung. In both cases, however, the *Congregation* is the proper praying subject; and *in pleno* employed and active; and when the Minister leads in prayer, he does not pray as Priest for them, but as Pastor with them. This is the case, whether he confesses their faith, or their sins; whilst, on the other hand, when he pronounces absolution, he appears as Preacher.

But could not, and ought not the congregation again to divide itself into *two subjects*? It is on the one hand, the ideal, educational, propelling congregation, and on the other the real concrete congregation needing advancement and improvement.

In our customary worship, she appears one-sidedly, and exclusively in this last point of view. She is only the needy, the asking the receiving congregation ; and not at all the possessing and imparting congregation. This is a real misfortune. The result is, that the Minister above stands forth in the name of the educational church ; and in this way it happens also that the congregation is sometimes led to look upon the ministry as a sort of Priest-hood, and to regard their exclusive privileges with feelings of envy. And yet the means of relief are so near at hand. The remedy indeed with instinctive anticipation, even here in Switzerland has already been applied. It is the *introduction of Liturgical Choirs into Divine Worship*. The Choir thus represents the ideal congregation. Only consider the following : According to the customary mode, the congregation assembles in the vacant silent Church—not even an organ to take the place of the Choir. The people are filled with no sacred emotions—they hear no inspiring sounds—they are not made to feel that the Church of Christ is something *already existing*, independently of their assembling at the time. The individual members do not feel that they are entering into the very midst of this already present divine power. On the contrary, they rather think that the Church is first to be constituted and properly made to exist. The concrete, real congregation with its need is in the foreground ; the ideal with its divine treasures is in the rear and it is the Minister *alone* who represents it. Now think for a moment of the difference in the effect, when the people entering the Church, are received by the Choir, as the representative of the ideal congregation. They feel that they are not strangers. The Church itself, to which they belong, meets them with friendly greeting. They need not first try by their singing to inspire their hearts with devotional feelings. As they enter, their minds are carried upward and fixed in a becoming frame, to take part in the singing, and become active in the worship. And as in the commandments, so in other parts of the service, places will be found, in which the Choir may properly be introduced, as the representative of the ideal Church.

If we pass on now to the *liturgical objects*, we will find that *prayer, the sermon, and the sacraments*, are the three natural objects of Worship. I say the sacrament, and not sacraments, because only of the sacraments *essentially* belongs to the worship of the congregation, whilst the others may just as well, if not with more propriety, be performed in the family, the temple at home.

In holy baptism, the child is taken, it is true, into the Church,

but not into the particular congregation. The church, indeed, embraces all the congregations, as well as families belonging to them, and it is this *congregation in the house*, sanctified by christianity, into which the baptized child is received. It only becomes a member of the Church, the communicating congregation, when it is confirmed. Baptism *can*, therefore, take place in the Church, with the silent acquiescence of the congregation—and this for the Minister is more convenient—but the nature of the case, and experience, both assure us, that this silent acquiescence in the custom leads to a mere mechanical attention, or inattention rather, and that the advantages are greatly on the other side. The house itself is consecrated a temple, and the finest opportunity is afforded for the exhibition of a proper feeling of private pastoral solicitude.

In the judgment of the Reformed, as well as in that of the primitive christian church, there are three classes of members of the congregation: the ruling, the communicating, and the passive, or those who take no part in the active duties of religion. By baptism, we become passive, by confirmation, communicating, and when we arrive at a particular age fixed by law, we are qualified to become ruling members—the communicating members have the right to partake of the Holy Sacrament; the ruling have, besides this, the right to participate in the government of the church, in the election of deacons, elders and ministers, and are themselves eligible to the first two offices. By excommunication, the right to partake of the communion is suspended, until restored, and that of having any thing to do with government is forfeited forever.

It follows from this, that the *communicating congregation* is different from the congregation *attending upon the sermon*, and that the solemnity of the Lord's Supper differs again from the homiletical part of divine service, although it properly follows it, as the highest grade of divine service—does not precede it—and thus in connexion with it, constitutes the *communion service*.

The *sermon services* may again be divided into the service for *Feast-days* (when some particular theme, appropriate to the occasion is made the subject of the discourse,)—into the *principal service for Sunday*, and *subordinate services* for the afternoon, or week. To this, may be added *special prayer meetings*, in which there is no sermon, nothing but the simple reading of Scripture, accompanied with singing, and prayer.

As to the *order* of the *principal service* on the Sabbath, I would propose the following :

Confession of sin,  
Penitential passage,  
Prayer before the sermon,  
Hymn,  
Text and Sermon,  
Hymn,  
Prayer and Benediction.

I need not attempt to vindicate this arrangement. It has for its ground the correct principle of the Calvinistic liturgies; a regular ascent from a sense of the need of salvation in the invocation for the help of the Holy Spirit in proclaiming salvation, and a gradual descent again from the prayer, for special and general blessings, to the blessings themselves. It is only new, so far that the two prayers, before and after the sermon, are separated from it by the singing of the congregation; and although they have special reference to the sermon, are nevertheless in this way, made more independent. It would be very unnatural, if the congregation were first to be prepared for the sermon, by a special introductory hymn, and then engage in a general prayer; then listen to a very special sermon, then another general prayer and then again a special verse from the Bible! How unnatural too for the Minister, when he has preached his sermon with great fervency of spirit, and is waiting to see the impression made by it, to be obliged himself to lead his people away from the subject of his discourse, to something entirely different! How perfectly natural on the other hand, for the congregation to yield itself in feeling to the impression produced by the sermon, and to respond to it, in the singing of the hymn immediately following, and then after the impression is thus confirmed, and fixed, to proceed to the general prayer.

According to this order, the *CONFESSION OF SIN*, as the opening service, should be introduced, and chanted by the Choir, and for this purpose certain verses of Scripture should be selected, two for each of the periods of the Church year. The first of these verses should contain an exhortation to repentance, and be chanted by the Choir, as coming from the ideal, ever existing congregation, to the individual members present in the Church. The second verse should be recited by the Minister, in the name and as the response of the real, individual congregation. Can any thing be thought of, that more happily precludes the Roman idea of the priestly pre-eminence of the spiritual office, than this?

The *PRAYER BEFORE THE SERMON* should not be immediately appended to the confession of sin. On the contrary, the



natural order is, for the congregation, on their part, to join in with this previously made confession, in a short verse or two of a penitential psalm, to be selected for each particular service, inasmuch as the constant repetition of one and the same verse would become mechanical. The Benediction, however, may immediately follow the prayer after the sermon, although the congregation should also unite in pronouncing the intermediate "Amen." The Choir should then properly conclude the services by singing the well known brief strophe, "The grace of our Lord, &c.," or the Palestrinian strophe "Be with us, &c."

To those FEAST-DAYS, which are not at the same time communion occasions, are to be reckoned the First Advent, Good Friday, on which in many places there is no communion, Ascension day, Trinity-Sunday, New Year and Fast-days. These Feast days are very different in their characters and objects. The First Advent, and Trinity Sunday particularly, are only distinguished from other Sundays, as the commencement of the two halves of the Church Year. In worship they are to be distinguished no farther, than that on the first there should be a special prayer before the sermon, and on the second, the Nicene Creed should be recited before the blessing. The New Year and Fast-days have their reason in worldly occurrences which should be spiritually improved. Seasons, and political associations constitute their ground. In both instances the nature of the feast requires that the confession of sin should be more prominent than on other occasions, and that the absolution should be pronounced with due solemnity.

For the NEW YEAR the most appropriate opening would be this: NEW YEAR-EVE; singing by the Choir, Thanksgiving prayer. Singing by the congregation, in connexion with a brief address. Confession of sin and penitential passage. Absolution and Benediction. In conclusion the Thanksgiving Hymn "Bless the Lord, &c." NEW YEAR: Singing by the Choir. Feast prayer before the sermon. Hymn, in connexion with the sermon. Prayer, and Apostles' Creed. Suitable Hymn and Benediction.

FAST-DAY: Singing by the Choir. Reading the Commandments. Hymn and sermon in connexion. Principal prayer adapted to the occasion. Confession of sin, with Absolution. The object of the sermon should be to direct to the confession, and therefore should precede it.

GOOD FRIDAY and ASCENSION-DAY may properly be classed with the historical Feasts, and their special themes should be the events they are intended to commemorate. On Good Friday,

the usual confession of sin should give place to a suitable selection from the Gospel narratives of Christ's sufferings. The confession, however, should follow the sermon, as on Fast-days, and be connected with the concluding prayer. It should not be of that general description, merely acknowledging our transgressions of the law, but a special confession, that because of our sins Jesus has *suffered and died*. After this prayer, the congregation should sing a part of the Hymn "O Lamb of God, &c.," and as the prayer is long, and is broken up into several parts, it would be well, perhaps, if the congregation were to fall in, and occupy the intervals in chanting brief antistrophes. The "order would accordingly be this: Chanting by the Choir—(something from Isa. 53). Prayer before the Sermon, and Lesson, with the Apostles' Creed. Hymn, and Sermon. Principal prayer. Sermon. Singing by the Congregation, the Hymn, "O Lamb of God." In conclusion, the preparatory service for the Easter communion, or the communion itself.

On ASCENSION-DAY, the usual confession of sin should give place to the lesson introduced in connexion with the Feast-prayer; and to the prayer after sermon should be added the Absolution. The order then would be; Singing by the Choir. Feast-prayer and Lesson. Hymn and Sermon. Prayer and Absolution, with the Benediction.<sup>1</sup>

For the COMMUNION SERVICES of the three principal Feasts, that of Ascension-day will suffice; and here again the Feast-prayer, and Lesson will take the place of the Confession of sin, and the Absolution will be omitted. The Apostles' Creed, in case it is not introduced in the Communion service, will be appended to the Feast-lesson. The PREPARATORY SERVICE, on the contrary, may be commenced with the reading of the prayer, together with the Confession and Penitential-verse.

Such then are my sincere wishes and propositions for the development of the worship of the Reformed Church in general. As to the division of the Church-year into periods, the following six will naturally suggest themselves: 1. ADVENT.—Characteristics of the prayers, should be: the need, and expectation of Salvation. 2. THE EPIPHANY.—Characteristics: Christianity, the light of the world, and its reception by the world. 3. THE PASSION.—Char.: Repentance, and the Atonement. 4. EASTER—from Easter to Whitsunday.—Char.: the spiritual king-

<sup>1</sup> On Good Friday, the Absolution is dispensed with, because it is rendered superfluous by the Communion, which involves a Sacramentally sealed absolution.

dom of Christ, and his world-subduing victorious power. 5. WHITSUNDAY—from Trinity to the Autumn communion—Char.: the inward transfusion of humanity, in all its powers by the Spirit of Christ, by means of the Church. 6. The concluding period—from the Autumn communion to the end of the Church-year—reminds us, as the close of the ecclesiastical year, of the end of the world. The characteristics should be the christian's hope, his expectation of death, eternal life, resurrection and judgment. The cycle of the Feas's, including these six periods, constitutes of itself the higher *seventh*.

If now, in the grouping of these prayers, I have so managed it, that they would be applicable, at once, to such a worship as has been here described, it is hoped that no one will conclude from this, that they are to the same extent inapplicable to our existing worship. The captions for instance, in the first chapter: Advent, Epiphany, &c., compel no one to make use of these particular prayers, the one only in Advent, the other in Epiphany, and prevent no one from using them at any other time, or from using other prayers in their place. In like manner, no one is compelled to make use of the Nicene Creed, and the form of Absolution, as I have taken them from the German Reformed and Netherland Agenda. I so arranged the collection that it could be used for the order of worship described; at the same time, it may be used for other orders of worship. I would nevertheless humbly venture to hope that the arrangement I have made in my collection, so far as it brings the order proposed into view, will serve to commend it to favor.

*Baltimore, Md.*

B. C. W.

## THE HUMAN TRINITY.

It is believed that the same distinction in the Divine Nature, which is indicated by the term *Trinity*, holds also with equal force in the Human Nature. Of course, an anthropological doctrine of this sort, needs to be well supported.

To the *Theory of Humanity* thus proposed, a few of the more thoughtful will at once be disposed to listen with candor; a second class, however, will regard it as a ridiculous attempt at claiming for man a relationship altogether too high; while a third, sick with sentimental piety, will have their nerves completely shattered at a monstrosity so profane, or even blasphemous.

But this notion is not so new, nor yet so strange, as by some may at first be imagined. Indeed, if the charge of novelty could be sustained against it with any degree of plausibility, this in itself were sufficient reason for giving it up at once. There is truly no new thing under the sun; and whenever any thing is announced as *new*, the simple fact of its novelty is *prima facie*, and even sufficient evidence against its pretensions. Even He whose advent upturned and re-shaped the entire order and form of the world, came not to "destroy" what had been, but simply to "fulfil" it. So it is believed that the philosophical doctrine here propounded, if faithfully evolved to its legitimate consequences, and to none else, instead of confounding aught that is good, beautiful or true in science, philosophy or religion, would only serve as a lamp and leading string to guide us through the labyrinth of human knowledge; instead of destroying any thing that is now known, would only tend to fulfil it, by putting contradiction out of the way, and so making peace among the sciences; and all this, by first stationing the human Reason in the Triune God, as its proper stand and starting point, whence it could *look through* the entire universe of being, and by referring every thing to its right relations, could *see* the harmony which the almighty Father, the all-wise Logos, and the everywhere present Spirit, have created, ordered and animated in all their works; and whence, consequently, it could take its departure, and with absolute *a priori* infallibility, thread the remotest spheres of thought and being, without ever once losing itself for a moment.

But an historical exhibition of the notions entertained concerning a trinity in man, whether by sacred or profane writers, in ancient or modern times, is alike beyond the purpose and the learning of the writer. His present aim is simply to present such facts and considerations as may serve as hints and suggestions to others.

A human trinity, to be of any avail, must stand in three concrete personal forms of humanity; and these last must be necessary both in themselves and to each other, in order to constitute the unity of that humanity. Such a concrete distinction, almost any one after a moments reflection, will find has ever existed, though unconsciously, in our own, and probably in every language, with more or less distinctness, as the spontaneous revelation or utterance of an internal, living reality. That distinction is into *Soul*, *Mind* and *Spirit*. In almost every species of writing, these three terms are perpetually used to indicate the entire man—not indifferently, but with instinctive discrimination, to



represent man as existing or acting in the spheres which they severally denote. There is therefore no need of manufacturing a new terminology, in order to express this idea, nor in fact any part of it, however extensively developed. All this, simple though it be, should furnish some slight presumption at least, in favor of the doctrine proposed, that humanity is constitutionally triune in principle, though formally unconscious of the fact.

Possibly it may be objected that these three terms are mere synonymes, or as nearly so as any three words can be. But this is manifestly not the case. Thus: "My *mind*, my *spirit*, is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death."—"Though absent in body, yet present in *mind* in *soul*."—"The *souls*, the *spirits* of the jury were soon made up."—Any one can see the confusion and absurdity of speaking thus. The words *soul*, *mind*, and *spirit*, are not each absolutely equal to *man*, and so equal to each other; but they are each equal to man when existing in the spheres which they severally indicate, thus: soul = man in the sphere of nature; mind = man in the sphere of intelligence; and spirit = man in the sphere of morality—for it is the *spirit*, whether good or bad, heavenly, human or hellish, that *moves*, that furnishes the *motives*, and so determines the character of actions and the quality of beings. Thus then soul is man, mind is man, spirit is man; and man is soul, is mind, is spirit.

But these three do not stand apart, or simply run parallel with each other. Each has indeed its separate principle to unfold and its proper offices to fulfil; yet for all this, it cannot be sundered from the other two, either in fact, or even in thought. The mind sees them apart, but only as it sees them together. It makes a distinction between them, but only by still keeping each full in its view. Its prismatic eye decomposes the unity wherein they stand, and refracts them into their logical and actual order and relations, like the three ground colors of the spectrum; and yet it sees them running through and underlying each other, and thus discovers that there is not and cannot be any definite line of separation between them. Each therefore pre-supposes the other two, and is pre-supposed by them; they all exist by, in, and for each other, and are thus absolutely necessary in order to constitute the unity of man. Root out either one, or confound them all, and the very idea of humanity is reduced to a nullity. Whatever cannot be divided, or is incapable of distinction, is a mere zero. Reduce humanity to this, and it becomes a point, the negation of all being, just as a mathematical point is the negation of space.

Of this triunity in man, the natural world furnishes complete

analogies on every side. The difficulty is not to find, but to select them. In the entire universe, however, first of all, and not merely in nature, the simplest, most fundamental category to which all things can be reduced, gives us this unity and triunity at once. This category as seen by the natural understanding, is simple *Being* ; as apprehended by the reason, it is *Personality* ; as viewed by the eye of the spirit, it is *God*. Each of these forms, is, from the nature of the case, cognizable, in its ground principle, only by a corresponding principle in the human constitution. Like alone apprehends like. No one of them can generate the other two, or be generated by them ; it can never develop their substance out of its own, or have its substance developed out of theirs ; nor, on the other hand, can it ever absorb and swallow them up, or be absorbed and swallowed by them. The distinction between them, alike when taken in their ideal, real and actual states, is an essential and eternal one. No logic, therefore, when proceeding logically, can ever confound them in one, or educe them out of each other. For instance, God and Personality can never be merged in mere Being, and so be fully measured and apprehended by the understanding ; infinite spirit can never compress itself into finite Being, or thread the logic of Personality ; nor can the abstract differential reason ever apprehend the concrete integral unity of either the Deity or created Being.

But though thus distinct the three can never be totally sundered from each other. For, first there can be no universe of Being, save as there is a God by, in, and for whom it exists ; secondly, we cannot conceive of a God that simply is, but that never acts or speaks, never creates, animates or reveals, that is all subject without either object or process, and that has beneath him no universe of Created Being ; nor, finally, can we think of Personality that is wholly and absolutely abstract, totally destitute of a mutual subject and object in which it inheres. Each, therefore, in its diversity, and all in their unity, are indispensably necessary to complete the simplest and most fundamental of all categories, namely, Existence.

At this point it may be said once for all, first, that every category, whether in the sphere of soul, mind or spirit, of the relative, mediate or absolute, does at once spring asunder and polarize itself as subject and object, the static and dynamic, the real and ideal ; and that in the very act of so doing, it eliminates and brings into play its third organic principle which gives us the living process of the actual : secondly, that every category presents a different triunity, according as it is viewed from the

standpoint of soul, mind or spirit: thirdly, that as these exist by, in, and for each other, the same category may be viewed by each of them from the standpoint of the other two: and fourthly, that every category thus radiates outward and spheres itself immediately into twenty seven others, alike when taken as the individual subject, the general object, and the particular process. For example, in the category of the Human, its three principles unite and sphere themselves, first, in the individual man; secondly, in the general objective whose ground-forms are the State, the School and the Church; and thirdly, in the family which is the mediant process between the other two. Thus every form of existence is completed only by three fully organized concentric spheres, that of the subjective in the centre, the objective in the periphery, and the mediant process between:—all of which, however, though distinct in principle and offices, perpetually permeate and fill each other at every point. Thus also every form of existence resolves itself, in the very outset of its self-evolution or revelation, into at least eighty one secondary categories.

This may in some measure account for the vast diversity of opinion among men on the same subject, their endless verbal misunderstandings, and the many contradictions or fallacies in which they involve themselves, by either unconsciously or purposely making a slight change in their standpoint.

For the sake of safety, it may be well here in the beginning to enter an effectual bar against all suspicions and charges of mischievous and heretical *Isms*, by a statement of one most obvious inference, namely, that every form of existence is complete in itself, whether dependent or independent; relative, absolute or mediant; in as much as it contains, in itself alike subject, object and process; and that, too, alike in the individual, the general, and the particular; so that however much one order of existence may be necessary to another; may pre-suppose it, or be prophetic of it; yet neither actually nor logically, neither in an *a posteriori* nor an *a priori* way, can one be reduced or educes, to or from another. For instance, the material world, the vegetable, the animal, and the human, though they can never be totally torn asunder from each other, can never be confounded in one, and thus be wrought out of the same fundamental principle.

That which embraces all things, is, as we have seen, Existence, which resolves itself at once into Deity, Personality, and mere Being. This last includes the natural universe, considered in itself aside from its divine Creator and that created Personality which stands as its immediate ruler and head. Of simple

Being or Nature, there are also three orders, the material, vegetable and animal, which, though mutually dependent, though as a whole falling infinitely short of the Personal and Divine, and though therefore prophetic of something higher and more perfect, are, nevertheless complete in themselves, are such that they cannot be evolved out of each other, either actually or logically, in as much as they polarize and sphere themselves separately, and thus have at least *an* end in themselves, though the lower has always a relative end in the higher, and its absolute end in the Creator himself. In the region of Nature, its lowest order, the material, as it is sufficient for our purpose, will alone engage our attention. The first step is to resolve it into the real, the actual and the ideal, and these again into the static, the organic and the dynamic. In each of these triunities, the extremes give us the subject and the object, and the middle term, the mediant process, thus:

	Static,	Organic,	Dynamic.
Real,	Matter,	Law,	Force;
Actual,	World,	Action,	Anima;
Ideal.	Space,	Motion,	Time.

This line of the ideal properly embraces all created being, and not mere matter; our present purpose however will confine it to the latter alone. As here exhibited, the polar factors of the created ideal, are space and time. The first is the maternal and passive principle and the second the paternal and active. They stand as the immediate parents of the visible heavens and earth, and constitute the volume and the perpetuity of being. Shut apart from each other, however, they dwindle in a moment to nonentities. Considered, moreover, in their ground principle, they have no ability to reach and embrace each other. Space has indeed a static and time a dynamic energy, but each in itself considered is altogether latent and powerless. But the ideal in the very act of polarizing itself into space and time, brings into view its third organic principle, namely, motion, which is their common and only measure, and which, therefore, alone has power to move and bind them together in lasting wedlock, and thus to give them that proportion, order, beauty, and consequent value which they possess.

Time thus stands as the objective, dynamic side of the ideal,



and as such, has its triunity in the past, the present, and the future. Eternity is the absolute of time, and is forever projecting itself outward into something individual and finite. In so doing, however, it is not throwing itself away piecemeal, in as much as this projection, like the tide that breaks upon the shore, or the fountain that leaps into the air, is forever flowing back upon the source whence it springs. Time is this entire projection in both its outward and its inward flow. The future is thus alone dynamic and self-moving, as it is forever coming, causing, and doing. The past, as something acquired, finished and done, is perpetually returning with its character and consequences, whose weight or gravity has a mere static pressure, urging onward from behind, just as bodies on the surface of the earth tend directly inward to the centre. The union of the past and future gives us the actual phenomenal present, just as a stream of projectiles from the earth is visible only at its turning point. Thus the present derives its motives, perpetuity, and hence its value from the future, and its consequences, character, and hence its weight or pressure from the past. Itself thus stands as the actual of time; here the past and future concentrate their substance and utter their significance; the present is thus emphatically the Word of time, by which alone it speaks and acts, commands, creates, reveals.

Without a past and a future, a whence and a whither, a history gained and an object to pursue, there can be no present, no where, and no existence; but simply a negation of all time and of all being, fully corresponding to a mathematical point, the negation of all space. There is therefore a necessity for the past, as a blushing bride, veiled in the misty dimness of recollection and robed in the welcome shades of night, to turn itself and go forth with star-torches and its train of virgin memories, to meet its spouse, the coming, the attractive and joyous future. By such lawful wedlock alone, can it become a legitimate factor, subjective and passive though it be, in the production and birth of the actual, ever-moving present. The past must roll itself onward; it can neither throw itself away nor stand still: we cannot conceive of it as a mere monotony, or as a solitary axis-revolution, fixed in either the same space or the same time; for this fixedness, taken either way, is a perfect absurdity; for, as we have seen, both space and time are made possible and actual, that is, a truth or true existence, only by the organic principle of motion. This movement is therefore not monotony but advancement; and in fact no existence, not even the earth, has an orbit that returns absolutely into itself, as Dr. Cheever a few

years ago would have it. The earth's orbit has a spiral advancement in space, and is thus tending astronomically as well as geologically, that is, in both space and time, to the accomplishment of some end. The earth beneath, therefore, and the stars above, both of them, through the living moving present as the Word of time, cry out against stagnation in the sphere of the personal and christian, whether Roman or Puritan.

This triunity of time corresponds fully to one phase of the same dynamic fact in the human constitution, namely, to memory, thought, and hope. Memory is the consciousness of identity and hence of immortality, and as such is the moral purse in which the sense, knowledge, and character already gained are treasured up. Memory is thus alike the ever-blooming mother of thought, and the perpetually ascending foundation on which thought itself continues to build its mediating tower that is ultimately to reach and ascend the skies. All this is possible, however, only as hope, which is the consciousness of life, comes with quickening, animating power from the future, and thus fills memory with vitality, and gives to thought, which is the consciousness of mere existence, the *cogito ergo sum*, its unceasing, miraculous activity. Thought in itself has, therefore, no past or future, but is altogether present. Statesmen, philosophers and artists become lost in their thoughts, theories, and ideas, "take no note of time," and have simply one continuous present. When linked with memory alone, it is lost in the past, bends over its tomb, sports the child again, or with its crutch fights anew the battle of life, totally unconscious of the *flight* of time. When arm in arm with hope alone, it plants itself in the future, dwells in the absolute ideal, builds its airy castles, and rears its lofty speculations, wholly forgetful of the *changes* of time. It is only when they all meet in the blazing focus of time, that the fully conscious present, alike as the genius of history gathers up the past, and as prophet lays hold on the future, and thus writes them as the real and ideal, the finite and infinite, the relative and absolute, and reveals their substance and power in the actual.

Space, as the subjective and static side of the ideal, resolves itself into the triunity, quantity, number, and quality. These are not mere ideas or shapes of thought, but are something essential to the natural world, and have, each of them, their three distinct forms. These in the case of quantity are solids, lines and surfaces. Here, as always, the middle term is the common divisor, and measures both itself and the other two, in as much as it alone can make known the how-much as to the contents of

solids and the extent of surfaces, and by this means reveal its own capabilities and powers. Quality as concerned with physical bodies, indicates their character in a triunal way, as subjectively good, fit and useful in their structure; as objectively symmetrical, harmonious and beautiful in form; and as possessing an affinity, proportion and ageement between their elementary poles, by which it is possible for the good, the fit and the useful, to become the symmetrical, harmonious, and beautiful. Between quantity and quality, number steps forth to declare the magnitude of the one and the worth of the other. In cardinals it gives us the multitude, weight, and dimensions of bodies; in proportionals it determines their constitution, ratios, and relations; and thus finally in ordinals assigns them their proper station, rank, and character.

Quantity, number and quality are thus in one sense manifestly something inherent in matter itself and necessary to its existence; and yet in another sense they are merely the first three fundamental forms of the human consciousness. This subjective fact in reference to space, merely corresponds to the like fact in the case of time; which, as we have seen, has a subsistence in the human constitution, fully commensurate with its subsistence in the material universe. Matter, though the lowest, is still *an* object for man, in as much as it is the first stratum in that conditional foundation on which he stands; and is hence continually telling its influence on his physical, intellectual, and moral character and condition in the various regions of the globe. Matter being thus an object for man, must of necessity have a subjective subsistence in him, in order to render its influence on him, and his comprehension of it, alike possible. Quantity, therefore, is the first form of the psychic consciousness, wherein the understanding, through the medium of natural sense, apprehends the simple extension of bodies, whether solids, lines, or surfaces. Quality is the first form of the spiritual consciousness, wherein feeling as the first germ of the moral sense, perceives and appreciates the character of bodies, (for this after all is something supersensible,) namely, their goodness, consistency, and symmetry in themselves considered; the fitness, affinity, and harmony in which they are united; and the usefulness, unity, and beauty which belong to them, rendering them worthy and necessary objects of attainment and possession as property by man. Number is the first form of the rational consciousness, which, through the medium of the logical sense,<sup>1</sup> distinguishes bodies

<sup>1</sup> The fact of a *logical sense*, is amply supported by the common notions of mankind. Thus, "a senseless fellow," does not mean one who is destitute

as one or more; gives their sums, ratios, and differences; measures, harmonizes, and arranges; and is thus the mediator, organizer, and revealer, alike of itself and the two poles between which it stands; just as light plays between the sun and planets, as object and subject, and reveals them to each other, and also through them becomes its own revelation.

But the notions of space and time, however perfect in themselves when separately analyzed, are, when viewed as the poles of the same idea, altogether incomplete. The first, whether taken as the measurement of extension or as a form of thought, can be known only by an absolute movement from point to point. The traveller walks around the pyramid in order to learn its dimensions: space is thus known only by an experimental, physical movement in space. But the pyramid endures: thought moves from point to point in duration, and thus becomes conscious of the pyramid's perpetuity as well as of its own successive movements; experimental motion in time thus gives the knowledge of time. Between space and time, motion thus steps in as the only possible medium that can give intelligibility or even existence to either of them. Motion is thus the prophet, the Word of being that declares and makes it known.

Motion, however, in itself considered, has its triunal form, namely, the revolutionary on an axis, the orbital around an objective centre, and the rotary which turns on a point. This point describes the orbital, and marks the equilibrium of the revolutionary. The simple rotary has its three elements, namely, the converging occasioned by magnetism, the tangential produced by electricity, and the curvilinear or circulating caused by galvanism. The first two are always and everywhere angular to each other, and give us, when magnetism is the base, the polar, meridional or magnetic circle, and when electricity is the base, the equatorial, parallel or electric. These two, as concerned subjectively with the earth, since they are right-handed and always keep to the right, give us the diurnal motion from west to east. These same two motions, in their objective relation to the sun, under the title of centripetal and centrifugal, give us the annual motion; and this with the former diurnal one, pro-

of the natural *senses*; nor yet one who has no moral sense, for he may be truly pious and have a keen perception of dependence and duty, and of right and wrong. It must therefore plainly mean one who is incapable of perceiving the natural, *logical* connection of things, putting them most incongruously together, and thus making himself "ridiculous" in the eyes of all "sensible" people.



duces the endless variety of temperature and climate, of day and night, and of the changing seasons. Thus then we have the simple circle as the proper measure of both space and time, whose dimensions, applied either way, are substantially the same, and constitute the elements of geometry and chronology with their kindred branches, or, more properly, the science of space and time.

But these material motions are not for the earth alone as if their only end were in themselves, but for man also, in whom they have a far higher end. Man, through his physical constitution, stands in full sympathy with these material motions: or rather it should be said that these motions have a subsistence in his own being. In his internal experience he has a perpetual succession of day and night, of action and rest, of summer and winter. The constitution of his own nature, therefore, demands a corresponding arrangement in the material world. It is this coëxistence of the same motions in both man and matter, that renders it possible for the latter to lend its aid in shaping the character and destiny of men in the various localities and climates of the globe. Of course no one can be so stupid as to suppose that telluric, lunar, and solar influences are altogether mechanical on man.

Self is the axis on which man's individuality revolves. As an individual, man *must* have regard to himself; it is a constitutional necessity, and does not arise from the presence of sin in the world. Individuality, from the nature of the case, has a concern for itself, as by this means alone it sustains itself, and in the end prevents itself from being absorbed as an emanation in the source whence it springs. Were it a mere emanation it could have no end in itself, and consequently no care for itself. Self-preservation calls for spontaneous and constant self-exertion, which has its alternate seasons of wakefulness and sleep, of activity and rest. To meet this constitutional necessity in man, physical day and night were expressly made. But while the individual has an end in himself and an axis on which his daily cares must turn, he has at the same time an objective end in humanity as the immediate solar centre of his being, around which he *must* revolve, if he will live and not die; for it is only by so doing that he has his moral summer and winter, his seedtime and harvest, his proper growth in fact, wherein the fruit of one action becomes the germ of another, and so on perpetually. Thus those who will not revolve, who will bow to no authority, first stagnate in ignorance, then ferment in fanaticism, and finally perish in rebellion and anarchy. But life for self

and humanity both, can be accomplished only through the medium of a third activity, namely, thought circulating around the point of self-consciousness. It is thought alone that gives consistency and order to both private and public life. In this point of intelligence and light, the freedom of the individual subject and the authority of the general object meet as opposite poles, see each other face to face, and flow together in that vital embrace which gives to the existence of man the only *truth* it can possess.

So much then for the ideal side of the material world. Next we may take up the real side, or matter in its chaotic, unorganized state. This resolves itself into mere passive, inert matter for the static subjective pole, and into that active, energetic force, power or possibility, which is always and everywhere present in matter as its dynamic objective pole. But this possible force, when it comes to act on matter, does not move at random, but is every way orderly, having its fixed forms and regular modes and ways. Nor has matter, though perfectly passive, any disposition to put up with base confusion and ugliness, but shows itself every way disposed to a goodly, orderly and beautiful existence. But matter and force, together or separately, seem, each in its own naked principle, altogether incapable of all this. Of necessity then a third organic principle must come between these two, in order to the accomplishment of those ends to which both are predisposed, but lack the inherent ability to attain. Material law is this third directing, unitive, and thereby revealing principle.

Distinction here is not mere fancy. The forces and energies by which we are continually met and obstructed or assisted in the actual world, in earth, water and air, are evidently something innate and spontaneous, and not a mere prolongation of some outward impetus given to matter in the beginning, when, as some would seem to imagine, the Almighty gathered up a handful of it from a bank at his side, made it up like a snow ball, and then gave it a jerk off into space, ever more by its inertia to retain the force thus imparted to it in an external way, and thence to break it up into the countless forms in which it is now found present in the earth beneath, the floods around, and the air above. The necessity of the case requires, as we saw at the outset, that every form of being have its own active and passive, dynamic and static, objective and subjective sides, and that these be mediated by some organic process, in order to have any actual existence at all. These three moreover, though absolutely indispensable, and so standing side by side in proper

honor, as equal and necessary factors in the same reality, must nevertheless be different in degree, order and rank. Otherwise they would be without distinction, and so perfectly equivalent and identical, that is, all static, all organic, or all dynamic; in which case the object, having no subject for its force, would waste it on a senseless void; and the subject, having no objective energy to vivify it, would remain forever inert, motionless and dead;—or perchance there would be a mediating process of order and law between two boundless zeroes. Each one of these cases, of course, is a perfect absurdity. Material force and law, therefore, cannot be mere properties or forms of matter in itself considered, but are together with it true existences, equal indeed, but not identical, in principle, rank, or honor.

Since force then is something essential to matter, we may naturally expect a resolution of it into three ground-forms. These are in fact gravity, affinity and caloric. The first has a consolidating, self-centering tendency inward, and the last an expansive energy outward, while affinity steps in between, weds and binds them together. Caloric in its native state is so intimately united with matter, and is withal so elastic and free, that matter, while fully surrendered to its power, is like the atmosphere almost transparent and viewless. Matter thus seems to be the proper body of caloric, the medium of its revelation; to have been created for it and out of it, as Eve for and out of Adam, and married to it, as its passive, moulding factor, out of whose fruitful womb, all the varied forms of the material world have sprung. Matter thus existed first in a gaseous state wherein, as always, the objective dynamic was absolute; then in the fluid state, wherein alone affinity can exert its forming and properly creative energy; and finally in the solid, wherein the various elements of the material world appear to have been eliminated, atomized and married, and so grouped and stratified throughout the earth.

Gravity, as the subjective force in matter, in its left extreme, is merely adhesive, causing the various particles of matter to stick to each other in a merely mechanical way, by the force of external circumstances and pressure, just as when two hollow bodies with adjusted edges, if emptied of air, are, *nolens volens* whether they have any affinity for each other or not, forced and held together by mere atmospheric pressure without. But gravity in its right extreme is cohesive, where particles of the same substance cling to each other, whether in the solid, fluid or gaseous state, as by a family tie, but still are not, and cannot be, intimately united, as this would be nothing more nor less than

material incest. But between these extremes, gravity unfolds its inhensive form, wherein the atoms of elementary substances, are chemically united, married and made one, so that they cannot be divorced and separated again, save by the same chemical priest that consummated their union.

Material affinity also has its three forms. On one side it is contractive, drawing still closer together, in a cold and selfish way, those mere particles and fragments of matter, those material bachelors and old maids, which simply outward circumstance and fortune have brought together. On the opposite side it is attractive, selecting and drawing together those atoms that are still separate and strangers to each other; and thus finally in the centre it becomes unitive, where the proper chemical affinity, the priest of matter, actually unifies its subjects, and thus produces a new creation out of dissimilar and opposing ones.

Caloric also has its poles. In itself it is repulsive; its various particles fly diametrically asunder from each other in every direction, as rays from a centre and always at right angles to the direction of gravity. On the other side in matter it is vivifying and expansive, and preserves it from shrivelling up as a barren hag into a joyless nonentity. Finally in its central power, caloric is liberative; here its two sides are brought together in matter and properly united; the one is latent in the other just as the soul hides itself in the body, and the two become one existence, which freely moves and circulates according to the laws of its own inherent being.

As, already intimated, matter, the subjective side of the real, has its three different states, the solid, the liquid and the gaseous, each of which is altogether inorganic and chaotic. In the solid state, matter, in itself considered, seems to be nothing more than the dead, extended carcass of that vivifying essence which once animated its various atoms and set them free to career at pleasure on the fields of space. In its objective relations, it is stubbornly impenetrable, holding the space it occupies, with bolted doors against all intrusion. Altogether it is lazily inert, the very image of a senseless fellow that merely occupies a certain amount of space; is lifeless and motionless in itself, doggedly sullen towards all beyond itself, and withal is so stupid that it suffers itself, without any resenting reaction, to lie where it is put and to go whither any kick may send it. Perfectly passive is it, even to vileness.

In its liquid state it is far more respectable. Subjectively considered it has life enough to rest in equilibrio, to centre itself on some point, and thus to repose in perfect self-satisfaction. So



much is it in itself inclined to peace, so much attached to the quiet of its own home, that any disturbance of its equilibrium is full of peril to the intruding foe. When by any means it has been ousted from its bed, it is crushingly oppressive to the power that holds it in captivity, and at last impatiently indignant, scorns its barriers and rushes to the bosom and freedom of its home, with terrific ruin to its opposers. But though so peaceful on one side and so wrathful on the other, yet between these extremes, and as the result of them, it is exceedingly loving and affectionate, readily dividing and resolving itself into atoms or definite proportions, which by their various elective affinities, freely and actively embrace each other and then take their departure to settle in their own appropriate homes in the actual world of earth, water and air.

In its gaseous state, matter seems to have been seized and carried away by that viewless thief, caloric, which robs it of its character, alike of its inert lifeless weight, and of its active lively affinity, scatters it up and down in space, and finally leaves it, in its relation to itself, destitute of all energy, imponderable and indifferent. But then in its relation to forces beyond itself, it seems to be absolutely insuperable, offering an amount of resistance beyond all calculation. On one side it is wholly surrendered to its opposite pole, and has no proper positive character, but is weightless, odorless, tasteless, viewless and soundless, not able even to breathe. On the other side it resists any force that would compel it to any motion or compress it to any shape. This seems to have been the primitive condition of matter when called into being, a condition, as analagous as the lower can be to the higher, to that of our first parents in the garden of Eden. But though on one side wholly at the command of the power that fills and animates it, and through that power on the other, totally invincible to any external force, yet midway between these extremes, it seems to be perfectly self-possessed, and constitutionally disposed *per se* to leave its gaseous state, and, *volventibus annis*, to descend first into the fluid and finally into the solid state, and in this way to acquire character, namely, weight, taste, odor, color and sound, respectively characterizing the five primary classes of substances which answer to the five human senses, namely, earths, acids, alkalies, combustibles and minerals.

Between chaotic matter and its essential force, appears material law, which is truly worthy to be dignified with the title, organic, in as much as it is through it that we have at once the wonderful phenomena of the starry heavens and the equally wonderful, though in comparison pigmy phenomena in the struc-

ture of our globe. Indeed the common notions attached to the terms *law* and *organic*, necessarily link them together. A law that is not organic, that does not develop itself in a uniform and logical way, is no law, and whatever is organic, must be according to law. But material law of course is infinitely lower and less complicated than the laws of personality: still matter must have law, or else forever remain chaos and never come to cosmos. What this law is can be known only by the united experience of both our outward and inward life.

The force of gravity is complete only in matter in its solid state, and the particular law at this point is evidently convergency. This is the natural tendency of gravity, and by it alone does matter become solid. But in this state under the action of law, matter cannot remain shapeless and chaotic. Consequently we find it actually polarized, that is, with a right and a left side, and thence also with a front and a rear. To its objective centre, the sun, it turns neither its face nor its back, as if either to surrender itself wholly to it or else wholly to deny its authority; but to that centre it turns indeed the right hand of allegiance, while at the same time it faces its own purpose in another direction, not opposite, but at right angles. Thus neither nullifies the other, and the earth maintains its separate being: but it is the polarized sun that has thus polarized the earth, just as it is the free Deity that has created free man. Matter is thus extended in two ways, having both latitude and longitude and consequently sphericity. The spherical then is the proper form of matter in its entire mass, as also of its particles when in a free and fluid state. This form is possible, not under a law that acts in a line diametrically against itself, but in directions angular to each other as radius and tangent. Convergency is thus resolved into its elementary laws of polarity, sphericity and angularity, the central one being that alone in which the other two find their common measure and become intelligible, just as the simple circle measures the angular movements of space and time.

Affinity is free to exert its force on matter perfectly, only in its fluid state. In this state, matter, under the force of affinity, easily divides itself, or, to use a term that properly belongs to man alone, individualizes itself, and the law of this operation is atomicity, or the law of equivalent proportions. The atoms of elementary substances may either be assembled in a free and pure state, in which the law is uniformity or equiformity; or there may be a chemical union by atoms between two or three different substances, in which case the law on one side is triformity, and on the other, biformity. The single atom of cause is the

common measure, and the three forms correspond with the three measurements of quantity, the solid, line and surface.

Caloric has expended its entire force and so brought itself to a state of equilibrium and indifference, only when it has brought matter to a perfectly gaseous state. The law of action here is divergency, not indeed diametrically against itself, but rather tangential to itself. Matter, under the forming hand of caloric, is in itself perfectly passive; and the law here, (to borrow a term that properly belongs to vegetable terminology,) is plasticity; but in its relation to other forces it is altogether rebellious, yielding it may be to violence for a moment, but only to recoil upon its oppressor with terrific vengeance. In this respect the law is elasticity. But both of these extremes are possible only through a higher principle or law, namely that of mobility, or absolute motion in space. Thus then the highest law of matter in itself considered, is sphericity; in its objective relations it is mobility; while its proper organic condition is due to the processes and laws of chemical affinity. All of this corresponds to the laws of the human world, namely, on the one hand to those of individual being, on the other to those of the state, and finally to those of the family in the centre.

Having considered the ideal and the real, we may now enter the sphere of the actual. Here that general force or essence that belongs to matter, appears in separate and distinct forms in the planets and other heavenly bodies. Each of these bodies has its own orbit and offices, and the force that fills and moves it, is a true soul or *anima*, whose body is no longer a chaos, but a cosmos or world. The world and its anima are not bound together by merely abstract law, but by this law now as a living concrete force, which gives us action as the highest, the culminating category in the sphere of matter.

In this *anima mundi* or world-soul, we have the actual dynamic agents that are concerned in all material phenomena. In the left extreme is magnetism, in the right electricity, and in the centre galvanism. These are nothing more nor less than gravity, affinity and caloric polarized, and are thus the actual of these three forces or possibilities of matter in its chaotic state. As already stated, it is the polarity of the sun, the objective centre of the earth, that polarizes this latter, just as an artificial magnet polarizes whatever is brought within the range of its influence; and thus as a matter of course polarizes those active agents which animate the world. Gravity, affinity and caloric, if not polarized, might possibly make matter up into balls; but these balls, if endowed with motion at all, would only roll and tumble about

in any and every direction, with axes as changeable and unstable as their motions.

But though polarized, still magnetism, galvanism, and electricity, if separated from each other, would be wholly powerless. But this total separation, from the *a priori* necessity of the case, is impossible, and hence the properties of each are continually appearing among those of the other two. They are therefore always actually united; but each in its turn is made the base of union, and thus owes its own proper activity and phenomena to the presence of the other two. When the left extreme is the base, we have, as stated, the actual of gravity, namely magnetism, which acts internally in matter, and not only polarizes the world as a whole, but also all its parts. Its power is altogether a subjective, individualizing one, and of course contractive in every direction from the periphery inward, as if the earth were made up of spike-form magnets with their points wedged inward towards the centre; so that if the earth were a perfect sphere, its contractive force for itself, and attractive for bodies beyond it, would not be greatest at the poles, but equal in all parts of its surface. This force of course is strongest at the surface, where alone magnetism and electricity have their angular union, and varies in the same proportion in both directions inward and outward. Thus the surface of the earth, wherein the currents of magnetism and electricity cross each other, is completely covered with a viewless muscular net work, whose tendency is to compress the earth into smaller and still smaller dimensions. In this way the contractive expels the expansive force, and thus tends by its terrific embrace, completely to exanimate the earth, and reduce it to a lifeless and motionless mass, giving us the actual night of nature, absolutely cold and silent. Darkness then, such as could be felt, would be the consummation of magnetism, and the whole earth, like loadstone, would be black as Egypt. The cold and dark silence of the polar regions of the earth, dwarfs, blackens and stupifies all that it touches.

When in the present case, the right extreme is the base of union, we have electricity, the proper concrete of caloric, or caloric in action. This does not mean caloric as eliminated from matter, that is, free and sensible as it is called, for that is heat; nor is it caloric in its latent state, for then it is properly quiescent; but it is caloric polarized by the presence of the same agent from the sun, and thus animated, vivified, and in its turn rendered vivific in its relation to objects that come in contact with it. For this reason caloric is a necessary agent in developing magnetism and electricity, or in rendering objects magnetic and elec-



tric. Hence it is electricity, or polarized caloric, that polarizes gravity, giving us magnetism proper, and the polarity of the earth. Here theory and empiricism march hand in hand to the same result, namely, that the earth, and of course also magnetism, owes its polarity to the presence of electricity. Thus it is always that the objective quickens its subject, so that the latter owes its life and all its phenomena to the presence, power and authority of the former.

As the solid earth is the home of magnetism, so air, or the actual of matter in its gaseous state, is the proper kingdom of electricity : here it reigns supreme ; here it moves with astonishing celerity, and its motion is perpetual. This activity, as intimated above, is occasioned by the influence of the same agent as it reaches it objectively from the sun. Thus called into life and put in motion, it is, or ought to be, the immediate cause of all the phenomena in the region of air ; occasioning evaporation and odors, raising winds and storms ; kindling fires, igniting the air, tracking its course in flame ; radiating, rushing, rebounding ; cracking, crashing and rending the skies ; bellowing, booming and thundering ; till the heavens depart in terror, stagger, groan and collapse ; and the prostrate earth itself shakes at the awful wrath that gleams and rolls in majesty above.

But between the darkness, cold and silence of magnetism, and this resounding tempest of electricity, we have the genial warmth, the cheering light, and the winning blush of galvanism. As we have seen, galvanism is polarized affinity, and is consequently the social principle and agent among material bodies. In the quiet earth it builds its fireside, and completes its social circle. Here it is the father of atoms, and the patriarchal priest through whose kind offices they find and unite with each other. Matter in its fluid state is the proper realm of galvanism, as it is here alone that the presence of a polarized agent can polarize atoms and thus dispose them to unite, and also render that union possible, by affording mobility to these atoms. In this wonderful process, three other distinct powers are developed, namely color, light and heat. It is said that light is the union of all colors, and doubtless this cannot be disproved. But the two opposing theories of light unite in making it altogether objective. This however of necessity cannot be the case. To be at all real, light, color and heat must have their subjects in which they naturally inhere, as well as their objects from which they proceed. Color can as well be evolved from the blackness of the loadstone, as from the whiteness of sunlight. In the former however it is latent and in the latter it is actual. Let

heat from the side of electricity be brought to act on substances blackened by magnetism, and all the different colors and their shades will soon be developed, until the substances themselves glare with the whiteness of the sun. Terrestrial light thus seems to be the product of terrestrial color and heat, the one being the passive and the other the active factor in the result.

The proper fundamental resolution of light, is into heating, coloring and chemical rays. The coloring are then resolved into the three primary colors, red, yellow and blue; the other four, orange, green, indigo and violet, being modifications of these three; and all of them, at least so far as the earth is concerned, come from the side of magnetism and are immediately vivified by heat from the fire of electricity. These are the particular subjective and objective poles in the case; though of course, as already reiterated, the sun is the general object that thus polarizes the particular. So also though sound, as the voice of electricity, is but one concrete reality, resolvable into seven discrete sounds, as light into seven colors, yet there are but three fundamental sounds, composing what is called the common chord. Give light and sound the same scale, and they will be found to coincide with mathematical exactness, so that the painter and the musician might sit side by side, and by sounds and colors in the same proportion, the mixture in one case corresponding to the chord in the other, might unfold the same idea, the one for the eye and the other for the ear. In sound, the minor and major intervals are the polar factors of music, and the "third" or mediant is indispensable to harmony, and gives character to it. When the minor interval is the base of a performance, it is, like the reign of woman, mournful from beginning to end. The major interval is the manly one, and the only one that ought to rule in music, save when sin and ruin are to be sentimentally deplored. But the two united as man and wife, can alone give us the true music of life. Then it is that the voice of each is heard in turn, neither all minor nor all major tones, but interspersed in sweet discourse, giving us alike the delicate charm of woman and the inspiring energy of man.

Finally on this point, of all the active agents in matter, not one can be spared. Cold and heat, darkness and light, silence and sound, color, fire and the breathing wind, are all indispensable to give diversity, vitality and unity even to the mere material world in itself considered, and thus to render it fit for the garden, park, and dwelling of man.

We may now turn to the subjective side of matter in its ac-

tual state as a world, or a body bounded off by definite lines. Here the three forms of matter are no longer chaotic, but rather concrete, namely, earth, water and air, each having its own appropriate office to fulfil. Here however it is not necessary to dwell at much length. Solid matter is that which gives body to magnetism, and also to vegetable, animal and human life. Air is the only element in, through and by which this life can have its actual existence. Water also is necessary alike to cleanse the earth and purify the air, and also to mediate to the higher forms of life, the various materials which they need for their own growth and development.

The solid earth has its mountains, plains and vallies, not only on its surface but also down through its lowest strata. In this way we have the various groups and families of geology, which give to the various latitudes and longitudes of the earth their own peculiar characteristics, and these in their turn tell their influence on the various families and races of vegetables, animals and men in different countries, and in different elevations of the same country.

Water also has its three forms. In itself considered it is gathered into oceans, where it reposes in the bosom of earth. In its relations beyond itself, it appears perpetually as clouds in the region of air, ready to descend in refreshing torrents where it is needed. Then again it goes in countless streams both on the earth and through it. The internal streams are like the human arteries that gush from the ocean of life through the interior portions of the body, while the external ones that roll back to the sea, are like the veins that conduct the blood back to its source, there to be purified and reanimated. In this way there is an endless circulation in the ocean itself, in and on the earth and through the air, all necessary, not only for the purification of earth and air and the vivification of trees, animals and men, but also for the purity and life of water itself, just as thought, whose office in the human world corresponds to that of water in the material, must be in perpetual action in order to its own self-preservation. Stagnant water and stagnant thought make that elegant rhyme, *pool* and *fool*.

Air is the element of vitality and freedom, in as much as it is the proper body of electricity, as earth is of magnetism and water of galvanism. As such therefore it is indispensable to the proper individuality of our world. It is said that the moon has no atmosphere ; probably then it has no electricity, no objective side to its own separate existence, and consequently no individual axis-revolution ; but remains in a chaotic volcanic state,

forever presenting the same pale and sickly countenance to the earth ; so that not without reason has it been imagined by somebody to be the actual prison-house of the damned ; for as they have renounced obedience to the authority alike of God and man, they have also lost the objective side of their own being, so that their own chaotic, volcanic state can properly be in sympathy only with the dreary, tumultuating elements of the moon. As therefore "coming events cast their shadows before," it is no wonder that an influence from this dismal dungeon, makes all who gaze upon it sickly sentimental, and even converts some persons into lunatics long before their time. In all this there is doubtless some little truth, just enough at least to show us the necessary part which air has to perform in the daily revolution, and consequent proper individuality of the world. Of air, moreover, there are three different forms, namely, the atmosphere or atmospheric air, which is the common bearer of the gasses strictly so called, and of viewless vapors that perpetually permeate it, giving it its cheerful, luminous transparency.

We now come to the category of action, the highest in the material world, as it is in fact in all existence. Material action, however, is vastly inferior to that of reason in the sphere of personality. Action, as we have now to do with it, is the perpetual process that is going on between the world and its anima, between the concrete subjective forms of matter, and the concrete objective agents which animate them. This action on the side of magnetism is contraction, wherein we have, under the direction of the corresponding laws of polarity &c., the crystalization of solids, the congelation of fluids and the solidification of gasses. On the side of electricity we have expansion, which, under the corresponding laws of plasticity &c., gives the fusion of solids, the evaporation of fluids, and the vibration of aeriform bodies. Finally under the power of galvanism directed by the unitive law of atoms, we have the process of the actual chemical formation of all compound bodies. In the right extreme of this last action, we have the combustion of gasses, and in the left, the volutilization of solids and fluids, and in the centre, their intense ignition and the actual evolution or creation of light, the very highest action in the sphere of mere matter.

Here we have a fact corresponding to that of self-consciousness in man. The world, as a subject in reference to the sun as its object, and, as we have seen, by virtue of its perpetual presence and influence, becomes polar to itself in every respect, and thereby has all its own powers and laws set in motion and filled with action. This action finally converges in a focus



wherein it evolves light from the substance of its own being, and thus becomes luminous, both visible to itself and capable of receiving and perceiving the light of other bodies, and so of surveying both itself and them; and all this, through the power of radiating and reflecting its own light, just as man does the very same thing in an infinitely higher degree, through the light of his own self-consciousness, as called into being and action by the presence of his own immediate object, humanity, which is itself again filled with intelligence and light by the presence and power of God himself as the universal object.

Once more: On the extreme left side of the category of action, we have crystalization, which gives to matter the highest form, in the way of structure, of which in itself it is capable. This, be it remembered, is the subjective side of matter, which, as thus crystalized, receives the light as it radiates from the central, creating process, reflects, transmits, refracts, and thus decomposes it, not only into the three primary colors, and the four secondary ones, but also into innumerable shades of each and all. Thus does matter individualize light, the infinite fact of its own consciousness, into innumerable other finite facts or colors and shades, by which alone the full significance, richness and beauty of light is revealed. This corresponds in full to the action of the subjective understanding in man, which individualizes the infinite light of conscious reason, into the countless finite thoughts and shades of thought, which fill up and diversify the three spheres in which he lives as related to himself, to his family and to humanity, and thence finally to God himself as the absolute, universal object of all.

Yet once more: On the extreme right we have the act of vibration in aeriform bodies, as inspired by the material spirit, electricity, which descends in the rushing wind and lightning-flame, and utters its oracular voice in the diapason thunder. This diapason is the unity of all sounds, just as white light is the unity of all colors. The thunder goes booming through the air, and strikes the solid earth, which trembles in its turn, reflects, transmits, refracts, and thus decomposes the oracular voice of the air-spirit into innumerable tones and chords that echo from hill to valley, and mountain to rock, till the dubious oracle receives its final resolution in the cadence that dies on the tremulous air and thus departs again to the spirit that gave it birth. This corresponds throughout to the same fact in the case of man, though the latter of course is fraught with infinitely more significance. It is by virtue of the spiritual side of his being, that man is endowed with speech. Thus it was that the prophets of old spake,

not as moved by the Father or the Son, but by the Spirit. Christ also in order to utter himself fully as the living Truth, received the gift of the Spirit without measure. His apostles also were unable either to apprehend or utter this Truth, till the descending Spirit inspired them within and flamed intensely from their heads. But once filled with this Voice of all speech, this Diapason of all language, they were able to utter it in any tongue that the case required. But spirit in itself considered, is infinite, and can utter only infinite sounds. These are represented by the vowels in written language. Understanding is finite, and in itself is perfectly dumb. Its signs then in written language are the mutes. Reason in itself considered is infinite but shades off into the finite, has no distinct articulation, and has for its signs, the ever flowing but indistinct murmur of the liquids. But the dumb consonants of the understanding, when touched by the infinite voice of spirit, do themselves become tremulous and vocal, by reflecting, transmitting, refracting, and thus individualizing the diapason tones of the vowel sounds.

But the highest beauty, majesty and glory are attained, when water and air in the material world, as reason and spirit in the human, are united in action. Then it is that the air-spirit, as prophet, darts his lightning-eye and discourses his commanding eloquence, whose thunders reverberate in pauses and periods of unequalled majesty and awe, along the pillars, galleries and dome-clouds of the sky. Then it is that the congregated waters, lead by this same spirit, now as poet-king sweeping the cords of his billowy lyre, rise and roll their anthem of stupendous praise. Then it is that this same spirit, now finally as priest, raises his hands and bends the bow of benediction over a reverent world; and when at last his daily task is finished, this priest of matter, crucified in the western sky betwixt heaven and earth and a spectacle to both, suffers dissolution, and robed in clouds that drip with his own blood, expires and is buried in the deep blue east, where, animated by hope, he struggles with the powers of darkness, and at last hastens in triumph to a speedy and glorious resurrection.

Thus then is matter a complete existence in itself, as might be inferred from its own spherical shape, which is the image of perfection. There is therefore no logical necessity, nor logical possibility either, of including the vegetable, the animal, and finally the human world in that of the material, or of evolving the three former out of the latter, or *vice versa*. We may therefore safely conclude that a certain Mr. Moses did not write quite at random when he said, (Gen. ii. 4, 5, 7,) These are the genera-

tions of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens, *and every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew . . . . .* And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, *and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life*; [that is, made merely his outward form or body out of the dust, while his life was a creation breathed into him out of himself;] and man became a living soul.

In the way of brief recapitulation, the following table may now be presented. The extreme particulars may be, and doubtless often are, imperfect, inaccurate, trifling, or even erroneous. Making all allowances, however, for these defects which may occasion a smile or a sneer, *the method of analization* here pursued, which may be styled the *organic*, will exhibit enough of truth for its own vindication in the eyes of the candid and thoughtful.

[For this table, see the following page.]

After what has been said, a triunal constitution throughout can hardly be denied to the material world; and the correspondence to this of facts in the human, here and there pointed out along the way, seem of necessity to call for a like constitution in man. *The PRESUMPTION in this direction is exceedingly strong.*—Moreover, if the creature be triune, then surely must the Creator be so likewise; so that what has thus far been said, turns out to be the clear testimony of matter in favor of the Divine Trinity. Thus the very stones cry out against modern Rationalism.

Unexpectedly this part of the subject has consumed nearly all our space, and we close with a few hints to trinitarians.—Those who hold the mysterious trinity in the God-head, ought not to deny the same fact to man: for what Sacred Scripture gives on one point directly, bears indirectly but surely on the other also. The trinity as such, works the salvation of man; it springs in the love of the Father, is possible by the mediation of the Son, is executed by the quickening Spirit.—Believers are baptized into the name of the Trinity as such; but how could this be, unless their nature also were essentially triune?—The Apostolic benediction commits its subjects to the love, grace and fellowship of the Trinity; but what sense is there in this triple guard for an absolute unit?—The first and great command demands a triple love from the *heart, soul and mind*, Matt. xxii, 37; the *καρδία*, as the seat of the affections, is the objective, spiritual

## Static :

## Organic :

## Dynamic :

<b>Matter,</b> {solid, {liquid, {gaseous, {extended, {inert, {impenetrable; {equilibrium, {divisible, {impatient; {imponderable, {free, {resistive.	<b>Law,</b> {convergency, {atomicity, {divergency, {polarity, {sphericity, {angularity; {triformity, {uniformity, {biformity; {plasticity, {mobility, {elasticity.	<b>Force,</b> {gravity, {affinity, {caloric, {adhesive, {cohesive; {contractive, {unitive, {attractive; {expansive, {liberative, {repulsive.
<b>World,</b> {earth, {water, {air, {mountain, {plain, {valley; {ocean, {stream, {cloud; {vapour. {atmosphere, {gas.	<b>Action,</b> {contraction, {formation, {expansion, {crystallization, {congelation, {solidification; {volatilization, {ignition, {combustion; {fusion, {evaporation, {vibration.	<b>Anima,</b> {magnetism, {galvanism, {electricity, {cold, {darkness, {silence; {color, {light, {heat; {fire, {wind, {sound.
<b>Space,</b> {quantity, {number, {quality, {solid, {line, {surface; {cardinal, {proportional, {ordinal; {goodness, {harmony, {beauty.	<b>Motion,</b> {revolutionary, {rotary, {orbital, {meridional, {diurnal, {equatorial; {convergent, {circular, {tangential; {centripetal, {annual, {centrifugal.	<b>Time,</b> {past, {present, {future, {weight, {influence, {character; {action, {creation, {revelation; {motive, {value, {inducement.

Real :

Actual :

Ideal :



side; the  $\psi\chi\eta$  is the subjective, "natural;" the  $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$ , the discriminating intellect that mediates the other two. Luke adds  $\iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\varsigma$  after the first two, to denote their united *strength*; for the extremes here as always, are the factors of moral ability. The middle term, *mind*, is required, since it alone is the proper principle of light and action, and no true deed can be done in darkness, that is, by mere passion without mind. Thus the Trinity creates and saves a trinity, and the latter offers a triune worship in return.

Again: Scripture declares that man was formed in the image of his Creator; but some suppose this image to be spiritual only, and not rational and psychic also. But no trinitarian can object and say that man's Creator was the Father alone, and not the Trinity as such; for it is the  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \epsilon\upsilon\kappa\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  that says: Let *us* make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness. This  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \epsilon\upsilon\kappa\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  may be resolved into the magisterial *We*, but the problem in this form is still the same, and can be solved only by the supposition of a human trinity; for no absolute unit can say *We*. Authority thus speaks, as denoting the deliberated purpose of a man and his triunal powers in council met. The king says: *We* thus and so ordain, and no one gainsays the inward necessity and lawfulness of such form of speech. Moreover, the trinitarian finds himself bound both by Scripture and reason to connect the entire Godhead in the entire work of creation, as otherwise he is unable to vindicate the character of the Logos and Spirit as being divine. This "image," then must cover man's entire nature; for if his spirit alone bear that image, whence comes the type of his rational and psychic being? Human creations bear the image of man complete. On this fact is based the modern mode of history. Men, Senates, Synods, reveal themselves through their own words and works. We come not at their souls, minds and spirits immediately, but only through what they say and do. So it is with the Diety. If any one say: Show us the Father, the Son, the Spirit, and it sufficeth us, he asks for a merely abstract exhibition, which is absurd. He that hath seen the Son or his works, hath seen the Father and Spirit also; for the invisible things of him from the foundation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead. God then is known, not immediately and abstractly, but through his Word and works. These then, man inclusive, must in their nature be triune, in order to reveal a triune God.

Still the objector may say: This image touches, not the constitution of man's being, but only his character and qualities.

But what dualism is this between a subject and his character? His nature remaining incorrupt, can he make and unmake his character and put it on and off at pleasure? Very convenient this, for some folks, as it dispenses with Christ, the mediating Logos, and makes of him a mere man, who only taught his disciples the art of manufacturing characters as articles of commerce for mankind; very convenient, for if a man happens to get his character burnt off, he can soon buy another, or manufacture one for himself. To this result comes a great deal of ancient and modern error.

But from the nature of the case, man at first had no character. He was placed in the Garden in a state of indifference, bent in no particular direction, but endowed with power to bend himself either right or wrong, and so of acquiring character by his own spontaneous and free action. Analagous to this, as we have seen, was probably the first condition of matter. Being wholly surrendered to its objective essence, caloric, the two were so intimately united, that the one was entirely latent, and the other wholly imponderable, and the two thus in perfect equilibrium, or indifference, both destitute of character, the one of weight, the other of quality. Not a little absurdly then do they talk, who confine the image and the fall from it, to character alone, when as yet there was no character to fall from. The fall, then, was in the very nature and being of man, not *from* character, but *into* character, and that a very bad one.

If we had room, we could press even this sort of argument much more closely.—Should circumstances permit, (which is very doubtful,) this subject may be followed further at a future day.

*Mercersburg, Pa.*

A. J. M. H.